

THE
AMERICAN QUARTERLY
CHURCH REVIEW,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XVII.

JANUARY, 1866.

No. 4.

ART. I.—THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN: DARWIN, HUXLEY AND LYELL.

PART III.

The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with Remarks on Theories of the Origin of Species by Variation ;
by SIR CHARLES LYELL, F. R. S. Philadelphia : 1863.

HAVING exposed the fanciful scheme of Mr. Darwin, and the illogical argument of Mr. Huxley, in the two preceding Parts of this Essay, we now come to the conclusion of our task, and propose to examine, critically, the views of Sir Charles Lyell, promulgated in his latest work on the "Antiquity of Man."

It is said that Napoleon Bonaparte rebuked the religious infidelity of Marshal Duroc, who had, on a certain occasion, expressed his belief in a very incredible story, by the remark, "there are some men who are capable of believing every thing but the Bible."

The three authors whose works are reviewed in this Essay, furnish an apt illustration of this remark. Mr. Darwin is unable to credit the Scriptures, which declare that all the forms of life were originated by a Divine Creator, and that all the

laws of Nature emanate from a Divine Lawgiver ; yet he has no difficulty in believing that all the distinct species of animals are the results of accidental variations of some common non-descript germ ; and that the laws which govern their existence have been determined by some imaginary and impossible principle of Natural Selection, which they themselves have fortuitously given birth to, in their struggle for existence. He requires us to disbelieve the authoritative Revelation of the Creator,—the authenticity of which is capable of verification,—and proposes, for our acceptance, the most improbable scheme of Creation which an unbridled imagination can devise, based solely on his own gratuitous assumptions. He rejects, as unreasonable, Moses' account of the successive acts of Creation, which is in perfect harmony with the disclosures of science, and his statement, that the distinct forms of animal life were created separately and independently, which also comports with all known facts : but he can see no difficulty in believing that all the distinct species of animals were produced by accidental transmutation, under the guidance of a physical divinity, itself accidentally developed,—although not a single fact in science can be adduced to prove even the possibility of such an occurrence,—or the probable existence in Nature of such a chimera as he designates under the name of “ Natural Selection.” Truly, the credulity of scepticism exceeds belief !

Next comes Mr. Huxley, a practical anatomist of distinguished merit, who believes that the suggestive and fanciful vagaries of Mr. Darwin furnish a sound basis for scientific theorizing. He accordingly lays down his scalpel, and takes up the pen, and by an argument founded on the differences of animals, which is not only illogical in itself, but absurd in its application, he endeavors to prove, in contempt of such “ time-honored theories” as the Bible propounds, that Man is the lineal descendent of the gorilla.

Lastly, Sir Charles Lyell, who has devoted a long life, with renowned success, to practical and theoretical Geology, is infected with the same credulous scepticism, and renounces, in his old age, the firm convictions of his vigorous prime, which were then in accordance with Revelation. With garrulous

prolixity, he has reproduced his accumulated store of facts, and written a book of 513 pages, to endorse the visionary notions of his friends, Darwin and Huxley, and to prove that man, if not of bestial origin, at least commenced his career as a brutal savage, and dwelt on this earth a hundred thousand years ago, the Bible to the contrary notwithstanding.

We shall deal with Sir Charles in the same manner that we have with his two friends. We will frankly admit, so far as possible, all his facts ; but we will subject to rigid scrutiny the inferences which he draws from these facts, and will test, by a rigorous analysis, the soundness of his theoretical speculations.

It is important to state, at the outset, that Sir Charles Lyell's estimates in regard to *time* are to be taken with great allowance. From the commencement of his career as a Geologist, he has always been a strenuous advocate of the theory, that all the changes which this earth has undergone have been brought about *gradually, by the uniform action of the same causes which are now at work, modifying its PRESENT surface*. This theory, which is in direct antagonism to the more prevalent one of cataclysmic convulsions, requires, as a necessary element, illimitable periods of time, to account for successive geological formations. Consequently, this claim of epochs of immense duration, in connection with his pet theory of *gradual change*, became, and still is, a special hobby of Sir Charles Lyell. It governs all his geological speculations, and gives a bias to all his inferences.

On the other hand, many other geologists equally entitled to respect, and some who rank higher, such as Elie de Beaumont of France and Sir Roderick Murchison of England, maintain the opposite theory, of sudden changes, produced by paroxysmal convulsions. Lyell has satisfactorily demonstrated the probability, that certain formations have been gradually produced by existing causes, acting during immense periods of time, but he is constantly forced to admit that these causes may have acted with very different degrees of energy at different times. This admission is fatal to any dogmatic assertion in regard to absolute time ; for the varying ratio of increase, being unknown, the time necessary for a formation must also

remain unknown, even if we admit its present progress to be gradual and constant.

The advocates of the opposite theory give us equally good reasons for believing, that immense changes have been produced by convulsive agency, causing sudden great disruptions and vast upheavals. Each theory, doubtless, contains a portion of the truth, and error lies in the extreme views of each. All speculations in regard to time, founded on either theory, can never amount to anything more than doubtful guesses, even when the speculator is free from the bias of extreme views. But, in regard to this element of time, Sir Charles Lyell is, and always has been, from the necessities of his theory, an extremist ; and as such, he undertakes in this volume to determine the antiquity of man.

After a short Introductory, our author, in Chap. II., opens the consideration of his subject, by detailing the works of art found in Danish peat, in Danish shell-mounds, and in ancient Swiss and Irish lake-dwellings. These Danish deposits of peat occur in hollows, in the northern *drift* formation, which constitutes the most superficial matter of the earth's surface. The basins or depressions in which this peat has been formed, or rather *deposited*, show accumulations of this semi-fluid matter, varying in depth from ten to thirty feet. He states, that around their borders, and at various depths in them, lie trunks of the Scotch fir, (*Pinus Sylvestris*), often three feet in diameter, and that "this tree is not now, nor ever has been in historical times, a native of the Danish Island." It appears clear to him, that this tree has been supplanted by the sessile variety of the common oak,—for many prostrate trunks occur in the peat, at higher levels than the pines or firs, and that this last, in its turn, has "been almost superseded in Denmark by the common beech." He admits that other trees, still flourishing in Denmark, occur at *all levels* of the peat, and that the shells, mammals and plants buried in it are all of recent species.

All these facts and statements are consistent with an explanation, which would assign to this peat deposit no very remote antiquity ; but our author draws his first inference in

favor of the immense antiquity of a pre-Adamite man, from the fact "that a stone implement was found under a buried Scotch fir, at a great depth in the peat." He asserts that Danish and Swedish antiquaries, by studying such implements, as well as other articles of human workmanship preserved in peat, in sand dunes on the coast, and shell mounds, have succeeded in establishing a chronological succession of periods, which they have called the ages of *stone*, *bronze* and *iron*, under which they class their antiquarian relics, as illustrative of the early condition of the aboriginal inhabitants. This generalization, or rather assumption of these Northern antiquaries, which is convenient for classifying relics, is immediately adopted by our author, who appropriates it as an established and universal truth, considering it of general application to all other parts of the world, and using it as a basis for other assumptions and generalizations of his own.

The following quotation shows the immediate use to which our author puts this theory, and is a fair sample of the very quiet way with which, in a hundred instances, and on very slight grounds, he puts forward his own opinions, or the assumption of others, as if they were indisputable truths.

"The age of stone, in Denmark, coincided with the period of *first vegetation*, or that of the Scotch fir, and in part at least with the second vegetation, or that of the oak. But a considerable portion of the oak epoch coincided with 'the age of bronze,' for swords and shields of that metal, now in the Museum of Copenhagen, have been taken out of peat in which oaks abound. The age of iron corresponded more nearly with that of the beech tree."—p. 10.

He then proceeds to speculate in regard to the progressive advancement of the primeval savage of the stone period, toward the civilization of the age of iron.

He finds, in the Danish "shell-mounds," evidence of the remote antiquity and original state of the primeval man of the stone period. These mounds, or, as they are called by the Danes, "kitchen refuse heaps," are very similar to the Indian shell heaps, which occur along our coast, from Maine to Florida. They vary in height from three to ten feet, and are composed of oyster and other shells of the neighboring coast, interspersed with flint knives, rude pottery, implements of bone

and wood, and the bones of various animals used for food. None of these animal remains are of extinct species, except the *Bos primigenius*, which existed in the time of Julius Cæsar. He concludes that the primitive man, who left these "kitchen refuse heaps" behind him as monuments of the stone age of the world, was not a cannibal, because no human bones are found in them ; that he was not an agriculturist, because no grain of any sort is found amongst this offal ; that man in that age lived by fishing and hunting, and had no domestic animals but the dog, because the bones of such animals are not found in these heaps ; and that he was of smaller stature than his successors of the bronze and iron ages, and had a small, round head, like the present Laplander, because a few stray skulls picked up in the vicinity or found in the peat, were of this description, while those of the bronze and iron age of the world, were "of an elongated form and larger size." He admits, however, that "there appear to be very few well authenticated examples of crania referable to the bronze period."

The early explorers of the new world found far stronger evidence to show that just such a primitive stone age existed *contemporaneously* with the advanced civilization of Europe, and that just such a primeval man roamed over the buried memorials of a *preceding and more civilized race*. In the supposed absence of all historic records, the archæologists of a far distant future, would trace back the civilization of the present iron age of the United States, to this Indian stone age, with just as much show of reason as antiquarians now refer the civilization of Europe to a primitive period of rude flint implements, from which it gradually emerged and advanced slowly, through successive ages of bronze and iron.

There is nothing to forbid the belief, that while a few roaming hunters were making their "refuse heaps" on the distant shores of the Northern Ocean, there were populous communities of more enlightened men in those Eastern centers of civilization, which are known to have been the oldest seats of art.

It is more reasonable to believe, that occasional contact with these centers subsequently improved the condition of these stragglers, and added a few metal tools to their stock of flints,

before they were overtaken by the general march of civilization, than to suppose that primeval savages gradually originated language and arts, during these assumed countless ages of progressive advancement, of which there is no evidence save these metal tools. The requisite time claimed for such progress, however small the original number of the autochthones, must necessarily have begotten a teeming population, which would have left, everywhere, numerous memorials of its presence; whereas, a few scattered bones and here and there a skull are all that remain to indicate the existence of myriads. It cannot be asserted, with any show of reason, that time has destroyed all but a very few specimens of this human multitude, and yet spared, in great abundance, the smallest bones of animals which they consumed for food. It is far more in accordance with probability, as well as history, to conclude, from these archæological facts, that contact with civilization had, from time to time, introduced weapons and utensils of metal, than to imagine long successive ages of stone, bronze and iron, in order to account for a few bronze or iron implements, found interspersed with the flint relics of the original sparse settlers.

Nor is there anything, in the occasional superposition or wide range of these scattered relics, to justify a generalization so sweeping, and so beset with insurmountable difficulties. That stragglers, roaming from the centers of civilization and becoming savage, should universally first adopt the rudest means at hand, such as flint and bone, to supply themselves with tools and implements of war, is conceded. That such savage tribes may have, in many instances, originated some steps towards the arts and sciences, and have invented, successively, instruments of bronze and iron, we will also concede. But do these conceded facts, and the relics which attest them, force us to the conclusion that man was, *ab origine*, a savage, just removed above the brutal state,—if not of bestial origin,—and that he has advanced from this brutal state to civilization, through the countless ages of time necessary for such a being to invent, first, *language*, and then arts and sciences? Or was he, at the start, created a more perfect being, endowed with speech, with developed moral and intellectual faculties, and with divinely

implanted germs of knowledge, which readily developed into those arts and sciences which his wants demanded ?

These are the two questions at issue. The latter theory is consistent with all known facts, and with the history of the race. It satisfactorily accounts for the rapid progress of civilization, in certain primitive centers, and for its subsequent lapse,—from adverse causes,—in these same centers, leaving behind monuments to attest its previous existence. It also satisfactorily explains the origin and long continuance of barbarism in those tribes which had become separated from these centers, and accounts for those relics which record their imperfect attempts to recover a lost civilization. This theory is taught and explained by a Book, the authenticity of which, as a Divine revelation, is capable of verification, and the testimony of which, thus verified, is decisive.

The other and opposite theory is maintained by our author, and by those who advocate the fanciful views of Darwin and Huxley. It requires the admission of great improbabilities, not to say impossibilities ; it rests chiefly on opinions, assumptions, and unwarrantable generalizations of isolated facts, and is supported solely by a few obscure relics of a barbarous antiquity, which are much more rationally accounted for by the opposite theory, than by the hypothesis which is proposed as a substitute. It demands, as a necessary element, an immense antiquity for man, and this demand Sir Charles Lyell attempts to supply from the geological record.

He brings to bear on this point, with tiresome profusion, all the opinions, assumptions and speculations of others, as suggestive, approximate or decisive, to which he very quietly adds, without proof or argument, his own opinions, in the way of correction, modification or confirmation. The evidence of the Danish peat and shell mounds, is summed up in the following words :—

“How many generations of each species of tree flourished in succession before the pine was supplanted by the oak, and the oak by the beech, can be but vaguely conjectured ; but the minimum of time required for the formation of so much peat, must, according to the estimate of Steenstrup and other good authorities, have amounted to at least 4000 years ; and there is nothing in the observed rate of the

growth of the peat opposed to the conclusion that the number of centuries may not have been four times as great, even though the signs of man's existence have not yet been traced down to the lowest or amorphous stratum. As to the "shell mounds," they correspond in date to the older portion of the peaty record, or to the earliest part of the age of stone as known in Denmark."—p. 17.

In other words, according to Mr. Steenstrup, the flint instrument "taken out with his own hands" from a peat bog, must be at least 4,000 years old; but our author thinks it might have been 16,000 years old, and that other still older signs of man's existence might be traced still farther down in the peat. He quietly assumes that the "shell mounds" are as old as the oldest part of the peat, and belong to the earliest part of the assumed Danish stone age.

In another part of the volume, he assumes a far greater antiquity for an implement found in peat; advancing, in proof, the opinion of a French archæologist, whose ideas in regard to the formation of this substance are not so liberal as Mr. Steenstrup's. To say nothing of the great liability of stone and metal tools to *sink* in the soft muck of a peat bog, there are conclusive reasons for setting aside all the evidence of man's antiquity drawn from peat deposits, upon which our author, in different parts of his book, lays great stress.

So varying are the conditions which modify the rate of growth of peat, and so various are the accidents which attend its accumulation, or deposit in "hollows," that no reliable indication of age can be derived from the quantity or depth of this deposit. Many facts corroborative of this statement, might be produced from the previous works of Sir Charles Lyell, and from other authors. But to show how perfectly unreliable is the above calculation, which is based on the depth at which a flint instrument was found in these Danish "hollows," we need only quote the words of our author used elsewhere:—

"The depth of overlying peat affords no safe criterion for calculating the age of the cabin or village, for I have shown in the 'Principles of Geology' (Ch. XLVI.)* that both in England and Ireland, within historical times, bogs have burst and sent forth great volumes of black mud, which has been known to creep over the country at a slow pace, flowing somewhat at the rate of ordinary lava currents, and

* See Book III., Chap. XIII., first Am. Edition, 1837.

sometimes overwhelming woods and cottages, and leaving a deposit upon them of bog earth fifteen feet thick."

The well known account of the bursting of Solway Moss, in 1772, caused by rains, the like of which had not occurred for 200 years, and by reason of which its peaty matter flowed into the valley of the Esk, overwhelming farms and hamlets, explains how the relics of man may be found in ancient peat deposits, accumulated in "*hollows*," without attributing to these deposits any great previous antiquity.

In regard, also, to the time necessary for the *formation* of peat, there is a remarkable fact on record, which proves the unreliableness of Lyell's estimates of antiquity, drawn from this source. In 1711, George, Earl of Cromartie, at the age of eighty years, published in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, a very valuable paper on this subject. He states that in 1651, in passing through the parish of Lochbrun, he carefully noticed a wood of very ancient fir trees, standing firm on a little plain of half a mile round, midway on the slope of a very high hill. On visiting this locality fifteen years afterwards, he was surprised to find in the place of this wood, a level surface of moss, with not a vestige of a tree to be seen. Upon inquiry, he was informed that the wood had been prostrated by winds, and that their interlaced trunks, arresting the moisture from the declivity above, had caused the whole to be overgrown by "a green moss or bog," which was unsafe to cross. Doubting the fact, he made the attempt, and immediately sank in the bog up to his arm-pits, before he could be withdrawn. He goes on to state, that in 1699, "the whole piece of ground was turned into a common moss, where the country people were digging turf and peats, and still continue so to do."

Here we see that forty-eight years sufficed for the formation, on firm land, of a peat deposit of such thickness as would denote, according to Lyell's estimate, an antiquity greater than that assigned to Adam. In the absence of this record, had he found, as he doubtless might, some relic of human art in the soil under this deposit, he would, as in other cases, have advanced it as an incontestable proof of a pre-Adamite man.

Our author next proceeds to consider the "Swiss Lake Dwellings," built on piles, near the shores of Lake Geneva and other small neighboring lakes. There is nothing in the presence or construction of these rude dwellings to indicate any very remote antiquity, for Herodotus informs us that the Pæonians built just such lake dwellings, to escape the attacks of Xerxes. But our author finds in some of them "implements of stone, horn and bone, but none of metal," and these he refers to the *stone period* of the world. In others he finds some tools and weapons of bronze, and these he attributes to the "*bronze period*," at which time arts had begun to arise among men. He makes a nice point of the fact, that the huts of the bronze period were situated more westerly, showing the *westward* march of civilization, in this little confined lake district. He states, that "the tools, ornaments and pottery of the bronze period, in Switzerland, bear a close resemblance to those of the corresponding age in Denmark, *attesting the wide spread of a uniform civilization* over central Europe, at that era ;"—a very sweeping generalization, based on forty rude metal hatchets, dredged up in Lake Geneva. In some few of these aquatic stations, as well as in other places on land, he finds a mixture of bronze and iron implements, and works of art, "including coins, and metals of bronze and silver, struck at Marseilles, and of Greek manufacture, belonging to the first and pre-Roman division of the age of iron."

He speculates largely in regard to numerous fragments of bones of wild and domestic animals, found in or near the foundations of these dwellings, and he conjectures, as in the case of those found in Danish refuse heaps, that "the greater number, if not all these animals, served for food." They amount to fifty-four species ; and he ingeniously distributes them, with the help of Rutimeyer, among these three assumed and remote ages of man ; they are all, however, animals *now living* in Europe, except the *Bos primigenius*, which existed in the time of Cæsar. We notice among those allotted to the bronze period, the ox, sheep, goat, hog, a large *hunting* dog, "and with it a small horse, of which genus very few traces have been detected in the earlier settlements,—a single tooth, for

example, at Wangen, and only one or two bones at two or three other places." He thinks, that in "the earliest age of stone, when the habits of the hunter state predominated over those of the pastoral, venison or the flesh of the stag and roe was more eaten than the flesh of the domestic cattle and sheep." But the great mass of animals constructed out of these *dissecta membra*, were common to all those far distant epochs of man's existence, within the narrow limits of these Swiss lakes, and were precisely the same animals which now inhabit the country. In addition to the common fishes, wild fowl and reptiles, he enumerates all the present wild mammalia, such as "the bear, the badger, the common marten, the polecat, the ermine, the weasel, the otter wolf, fox, wild cat, hedgehog, squirrel, field mouse, &c.," the greater part or all of which he tells us served for food. Not a very inviting bill of fare, certainly. Perhaps, however, these unsavory animals were killed for their *skins*; the assumption that they were used for food, is entirely gratuitous.

While the bones of the fox occur every where in great abundance, he tells us that only "a single fragment of the bone of a hare has been found at Moosseedorf." He assumes, backed by the authority of Rutimeyer, that this fact proves a universal preference of fox to hare, on the part of the lake-dwellers of the stone period, and "establishes a singular contrast between their tastes and ours." This is a very astonishing deduction from a single fact, and is based, also, on a gratuitous assumption. This solitary fragment of bone might be good evidence that hares were scarce *where* foxes were plenty; but who, except a *savant*, would ever have dreamed that this solitary bone could be *proof* of a universal preference of fox-meat to hare, and *establish* such a singular contrast of tastes between the gourmands of the Swiss stone period and the British age of iron? To an unsophisticated mind, such generalizations would seem to manifest more imagination than common sense.

He also informs us, that, "amidst all this profusion of animal remains" which served for food to men belonging to different ages of the world, during three long chronological ages,

only one solitary human skull is found, to represent the three ages of stone, bronze, and iron.

After careful examination of this solitary specimen, Professor His observes, that "it exhibits, instead of the small, rounded form, proper to the Danish peat mosses, a type much more like that now prevailing in Switzerland, which is intermediate between the long-headed and short-headed form." This is, doubtless, a very correct and cautious observation of Prof. His; and the plain, common-sense conclusion is, that it belonged to the present Swiss race, since it has their prevailing characteristics. But this skull is authoritatively pronounced to be "of the early stone period," simply because it was dredged up in that part of the Lake of Zurich which is assumed to have been the theater of the stone period. Accordingly, the inference which our author draws from this opinion of Prof. His, is the following:—"So far, therefore, as we can draw safe conclusions from a single specimen, there has been no marked change of race in the human population of Switzerland, during the periods above considered."

Here we have another brilliant generalization of an assumption, based moreover on the perversion of a cautious opinion. A solitary skull, which is *assumed* to belong to the early stone age of Switzerland,—though differing from another solitary skull, which was made the type of the same age, "of a uniform civilization," in Denmark,—is pronounced by Prof. His to be similar to those of the *present* Swiss race. Thereupon, our author makes this solitary skull typical, also, of the other two ages, and comes gravely to the conclusion, (with a salvo,) that there has been *no marked change in the human population of Switzerland, during the ages of stone, bronze, and iron!* This, certainly, is generalizing with a vengeance; we need not the cautionary salvo of the author, to guard us against the fallacy of such unscientific speculations.

On the strength of such assumptions, we are called upon to believe that the present Swiss population have come down, with little change of race, from the primeval savage of the stone period;—that their rude fox-eating forefathers continued to inhabit a little lake district, until they had there instituted

agriculture and metallurgic arts, during two successive ages of civilization, necessarily embracing a period of time sufficiently long to fill all Switzerland with an overflowing population, and convert it into a populous cemetery of the dead ;—that, although numerous animal remains and cereals used for food, are said to manifest the habits and tastes of each age, yet they left behind them only the remnants of a few wooden huts, some metal tools, and a solitary skull, to attest the existence of vast multitudes, their peculiarities of race, and their gradual progress towards civilization, through long successive ages of stone, bronze, and iron !

Assuredly, scientific men who have hobbies to ride, go out of their way to invent grave absurdities. The only rational explanation of the facts, which does not do violence to common sense, is, that a few rude savages had built temporary hunting lodges in the water, for fishing purposes, and probably, also, to protect themselves from abounding wild beasts,—and that the pioneers who preceded the Roman invasion of Helvetia, introduced the few metal utensils, which form the sole foundation for these assumed ages of stone, bronze, and iron.

But our author brings geological evidence to prove the existence of his three chronological ages, in this particular locality, and estimates, upon the authority of M. Morlot, their duration in years. The case which he cites,—though imperfect in its details,—is one of the strongest in the book. We will, therefore, quote it entire, for the purpose of cross-examining the evidence which is adduced in support of its conclusions.

He says .—

“The attempts of the Swiss geologists and archæologists to estimate definitely in years the antiquity of the bronze and stone periods, although as yet confessedly imperfect, deserve notice, and appear to me to be full of promise. The most elaborate calculation is that made by M. Morlot, respecting the delta of the Tinière, a torrent which flows into the Lake of Geneva, near Villeneuve. This small delta, to which the stream is annually making additions, is composed of gravel and sand. Its shape is that of a flattened cone, and its internal structure has of late been laid open to view, in a railway cutting one thousand feet long and thirty-two feet deep. The regularity of its structure throughout implies that it has been formed very gradually, and

by the uniform action of the same causes. Three layers of vegetable soil, each of which must at one time have formed the surface of the cone, have been cut through at different depths. The first of these was traced over a surface of 15,000 square feet, having an average thickness of five inches, and being about four feet below the present surface of the cone. This upper layer belonged to the Roman period, and contained Roman tiles and a coin. The second layer followed over a surface of 25,000 square feet, was six inches thick, and lay at a depth of ten feet. In it were found fragments of pottery unvarnished, and a pair of tweezers in bronze, indicating the bronze epoch. The third layer, followed for 35,000 square feet, was six or seven inches thick, and nineteen feet deep. In it were fragments of rude pottery, pieces of charcoal, broken bones, and a human skeleton having a small, round and very thick skull. M. Morlot, assuming the Roman period to represent an antiquity of from sixteen to eighteen centuries, assigns to the bronze age a date of between 3,000 and 4,000 years, and to the oldest layer, that of the stone period, an age of from 5,000 to 7,000 years."—p. 28.

We have examined the Memoir of M. Morlot, and find the "elaborate calculation," referred to above, to be merely an approximative conjecture, based on the growth of the cone in proportion to the volume of its alluvium, and varying from 5,000 to 11,000 years. The above figures are, therefore, to be considered as guesses. We also find that M. Morlot, after diligent search in the bed of the so-called stone period, "has not had the good fortune to discover in it any stone hatchet or other antiquity of that sort." The animal bones found in this bed belong to "the ox, goat, sheep, pig and dog, all domestic," and such as are assigned to the bronze and iron age. The skull, also, found in this lowest bed, "was very round and small, and remarkably thick, showing a strongly-marked Mongolian type," an entirely different type from that assigned by Lyell to the Swiss stone period.

According to M. Morlot, the torrent of the Tinière, where it flows into the Lake of Geneva, like other Alpine torrents issuing from ravines or small lateral valleys, forms a rounded, "*fan-like*" deposit or flattened cone at its mouth. This cone has an inclination of four degrees, corresponding to the bed of the torrent; its radius is 900 Swiss feet, and its transverse diameter is 1,000 feet at its central part, where the railway cuts through it at right angles, or perpendicularly to its axis. The greatest height of this conical mound is at the central

part of the railway section, and is just $32\frac{1}{2}$ feet above the level of the rails. So far as the size of this cone is concerned, the whole quantity of matter comprising it might have been deposited during a single season, by such extraordinary inundations as have been known to occur in that district in modern times. One which occurred so late as 1818, to which we will presently refer, deposited in a similar position a vastly greater amount of transported matter. But Lyell, in accordance with a theory which he has made a pet hobby, assumes "that it has been formed *very gradually*, and by the *uniform* action of the same causes." Let us see what evidence there is to support this assumption. We are informed that this deposit is composed of four gravel beds, separated by three intervening layers of soil. Taking the dimensions of these beds as stated, but reversing their order, the first or lowest deposit of gravel and sand brought down by the torrent, was thirteen feet thick, and on the top of this was found his primitive man of the so-called stone period. The next bed was nine feet thick, and this underlaid his assumed bronze period. The third bed was six feet thick, which reached up to his Roman iron period ; while the last deposited bed of four feet, forms the present top of the cone. Now, whatever length of time may have elapsed between the deposition of the first and last of these beds, it is very certain that they could not all have been continuously deposited by the very gradual and uniform action of the river, as asserted. It is evident that this action must have been completely suspended, during three intervals of indefinite duration, in order to permit the formation of three successive layers of vegetable soil ; otherwise the whole mass would have been a homogeneous deposit of sand and gravel, undivided by these intervening layers. The facts of the case, therefore, forbid the assumption that this mass was formed gradually, by the continuous and uniform action of the river, but justify us in concluding that it was produced at intervals, and by extraordinary freshets. Again, on what authority does he make this isolated sand cone, washed down by a mountain torrent, and superimposed on the alluvial drift, which forms the very outer vestment of the earth, the theater of successive chronological ages of immense

duration? We admit that the Roman coin is proof that men existed at the time of, or subsequent to, the Roman invasion. But the only evidence that he has of the existence of a preceding bronze age, is a solitary *bronze tweezers*! Now this bronze instrument was in very common use at Rome, by men as well as women, and is just as good proof of a Roman iron age, as a copper or silver coin is. The only evidence he has of a primitive stone period, is a human skeleton, with a small, round and very thick skull. This round skull, by the bye, is quite different from the elongated one which was dredged out of this same Lake of Geneva, and which was made, as we have seen, the type of the lake dwellers of the stone period.

A thick, round skull, and a solitary bronze tweezers, found in a hillock of sandy gravel, washed down by a mountain torrent, are the only evidences to support our author's foregone conclusion of successive ages of stone and bronze. It is true, he speaks of "fragments of rude pottery," but broken pieces of pottery, however rude, without specific notes and marks, are valueless as determining the question of age. Pottery is the most universal as well as the earliest of the arts, and fragments of unglazed earthen ware, and the rudest pottery, may be found among civilized nations of modern date. Rudeness alone is no test of age. We doubt not that the coarse pottery used by Roman soldiers, after being smashed to fragments, and lying in the ground for 1800 years, would look rude enough to the eye of an archaeologist, to be assigned to the so-called stone period.

Upon what data does M. Morlot base his conjecture, that this assumed stone period is from 5,000 to 7,000 years old? We are informed that it rests on the assumption that the Roman period, indicated by the coin found four feet below the top of the cone, represents an antiquity of from sixteen to eighteen centuries. If so, the question is easily solved by the rule of three. If it takes 1,800 years to make 4 feet of deposit, how long would it take to make a deposit of 32 feet? But this calculation would give far greater antiquity than is claimed. Besides, it presupposes that the whole cone has been deposited continuously and uniformly, which assumption is proved to be

untenable, by the existence of intervening layers of soil. Nor is the calculation, founded on the thickness of these layers of soil and the probable time necessary for their formation, a whit more reliable. Facts prove that, in some cases, thousands of years are necessary to produce a thin covering of soil, while in others, a few hundred years are sufficient for the production of thick layers ; and then again, in other cases, such layers have been formed, as it were, immediately. The sudden covering up of a rank vegetation by earthy matter, the overwhelming and subsequent decay of a forest, the soil and vegetable matter transported by an inundation, and then deposited, are all capable of producing immediately just such "layers of vegetable soil" as occur between the gravel beds deposited by the River Tinière. Herculaneum furnishes evidence which is decisive on this point. The date of its destruction is well known ; and in regard to it, Sir William Hamilton remarks :—"The matter which covers the ancient town of Herculaneum, is not the produce of one eruption only ; for there are evident marks that the matter of six eruptions has taken its course over that which lies immediately above the town, and was the cause of its destruction. These strata are either of lava or burnt matter, with *veins of good soil betwixt them.*"*

A geological observer, who is not wedded to this *ultra* theory of very gradual formation which ignores all catastrophes, and who is not committed to the hypothesis of a universal and inevitable succession of stone, bronze, and iron ages, finds no necessity for imagining periods of immense duration, in order to account for the formation of this deposit of gravel, from the effect of causes still operating in this same district. In 1818, the River Dranse, a mountain torrent similar to the Tinière, and which empties into the Rhone through the broad valley of Bagnes, became, in consequence of a succession of very cold winters, dammed up in its mountain gorges, with ice so thick as to resist the usual melting of the summer heat. A lake was thus formed near its source, containing 800 millions of cubic feet of water, held back by a dam of ice, which was liable to

* "Philosophical Transactions," Vol. LXI. p. 7.

give way at any moment, and overwhelm the cultivated plains below. To avert the impending calamity, M. Venetz was employed to tunnel the icy barrier. By means of an artificial gallery, a large portion of the water was gradually drawn off; but at length the dam gave way, and the lake was suddenly emptied of the remainder of the water. The mighty flood precipitated itself through a succession of gorges and basins, stripping the mountain sides of soil and forests, and lower down carrying off houses, barns and whole farms, with cattle and men; rising to the height of ninety feet above the bed of the Dranse, and threatening with instant destruction the inclined plane on which the large village of Le Chable is situated. The huge tide gathering fresh spoils at every step, and resembling a "moving chaos" of rock and mud, more than water, "continued its work of destruction till its fury became weakened by expanding itself over the great plain formed by the valley of the Rhone," and in six and a half hours it discharged itself into the Lake of Geneva. The engineer, M. Escher, in his Memoir of this event, informs us that a stratum of alluvial matter, *several feet in thickness, was deposited over the whole of the lower part of the broad valley of Bagnes*. Several other instances are on record, to prove that precisely the same cause has repeatedly produced similar results, in this same region. This cause furnishes a sufficient explanation of the fact that successive deposits at the mouth of the Tinière have been, at different intervals and in separate beds, piled up to the height of 32½ feet above the lake, which never could have been accomplished by the ordinary, gradual and uniform deposition of the river, as Sir Charles Lyell contends. It is perfectly legitimate to conclude, that the same cause which has repeatedly produced extraordinary inundations in this district, attended with such remarkable results, as in the case of the Dranse, has also at other times similarly affected the Tinière, the conditions of both rivers being similar. We may infer that at different intervals, this latter mountain torrent has, also, from the same cause, in a less degree, and on a more circumscribed area, transported and deposited at its mouth, extraordinary quantities of alluvial matter; that the heavier parti-

cles of gravel and sand have settled below, while the lighter earth and drift wood have formed over them the "layers of vegetable soil;" that successive beds have thus been added, by successive inundations; and that the whole mass has, in the course of time, been rounded by the elements into its present cone-like shape.

Nor is there any thing in the character of the relics contained in this mound, to forbid the conclusion that the whole deposit has been formed subsequent to the earliest Roman period. The first inundation buried the wild native, found in the lowest bed, while the subsequent ones swept up from some neighboring surface the bronze tweezer and the coin, both of which are equally good attestations of the Roman invader.

We have dwelt at some length on this Tinière deposit, because it seems one of the strongest cases in the book, and because it is a very fair sample of the manner by which, in every chapter, assumptions and opinions are made to take the place of evidence and reason, in order to establish foregone conclusions.

Chapter III. treats, under separate heads, of "fossil human remains, and works of art," found in the Nile mud, in ancient mounds of the valley of the Ohio, and in the Delta of the Mississippi; of recent deposits of seas and lakes, and of the upheaval of Scotland, and other districts. Under each of these heads, Lyell gives numerous opinions and assumptions, to establish the immense antiquity of man.

Under the first head, he inculcates the peculiarly ultra views and very unreliable opinions of Mr. Leonard Horner. This gentleman induced the Royal Society to contribute funds toward some experiments he was desirous of making in the Nile valley. He intrusted the work to an Armenian engineer, Hekekyan Bey, who employed some sixty Arabs to dig shafts sixteen to twenty-four feet deep, and to bore Artesian holes sixty to seventy feet deep. In the first case, some "jars, vases, pots, and a small human figure in burnt clay, a copper knife, and other entire articles were dug up." From the borings, "pieces of burnt brick and pottery were extracted almost every where, and from all depths, even where they sank sixty feet below the

surface, toward the central parts of the valley." "Another fragment of red brick was found by Linant Bey, in a boring seventy-two feet deep."

These are the facts; now for the conclusions. M. Girard "*supposed*" the average rate of the increase of Nile mud to be five English inches in a century. Our author allows an extra inch, and says, "were we to *assume* six inches in a century, the burnt brick met with at a depth of sixty feet, would be 12,000 years old."

In regard to the other fragment of red brick, he remarks:—"M. Rosine, in the great French work on Egypt, has estimated the mean rate of deposit of sediment in the delta at two inches, and three lines in a century; were we to take two and a half inches, (our author is not so generous in this case,) a work of art seventy-two feet deep *must* have been buried more than 30,000 years ago." To this conclusion, presented as an inevitable *necessity*, we would simply add the proviso, *unless* it had been buried at some time subsequently. The great probability of such a contingency is in fact admitted by the author, for he says, if the boring of Linant Bey was made where an arm of the river had been silted up, "the brick in question might be, comparatively, very modern." Here we have the key to the position of these fragments, and the solution of the whole difficulty. This silting up and shifting of the arms of the river, explain all the discoveries of these Arabian borers, even admitting them to be reliable, as our author maintains, though he frankly acknowledges that some raise the objection, "that the Arabs can always find whatever their employers desire to obtain." But another, and much more serious objection is found in the fact, that burnt bricks were not used in Egypt till the time of the Romans. This Lyell combats, as an erroneous opinion; but how does he do it? He tells us that Mr. S. Birch assures him that it is erroneous, because "he has under his charge, in the British Museum, first a small rectangular baked brick, which came from a Theban tomb," supposed, by the style of art and inscription, to be as old as about 1450 B. C.;—"secondly, an arched brick," with a partially effaced inscription, ending with the words, "of the temple of

Amen Ra," which "is referred, conjecturally, by Mr. Birch, to the 19th dynasty, or 1300 B. C." We are not informed that this brick was baked, unless we are to infer from the term "arched," that it formed part of the arch of a brick-kiln.

This is all that Lyell advances, to disprove the well-known fact, that the common use of burnt bricks was introduced by the Romans, and to support his assumption that fragments of burnt brick must be considered as old as the conjectural age of the mud in which they have been buried. What sort of argument or evidence is this? Because two, or, strictly speaking, only one rectangular piece of *baked* clay, inscribed as a memorial, and *supposed* to be as old as 1450 B. C., is found amid ruins, where a thousand examples attest the universal prevalence of *unbaked* bricks, therefore we must conclude that red burnt brick, precisely like that introduced by the Romans, "extracted almost everywhere and from all depths" in the mud, is 30,000 years old, if Linant Bey happens, as alleged, to bring up a fragment from a boring seventy-two feet deep. With such kind of reasoning, founded on exceptional cases and accidental contingencies, and built up with the various conjectures and assumptions of others, one might prove or disprove anything in the world.

It is remarkable, that Sir Charles Lyell, after enumerating the jars, vases, pots, copper knife, &c., which were found entire in the shafts dug by these Arabians, makes no further mention of them. They certainly would furnish far more reliable evidence in regard to age, than the pulverized detritus brought up by the boring auger; yet he says nothing about them. Some of our readers will recollect the animated discussions which took place, two or three years ago, in the Athenæum, Times, London Record, and other English papers, and which were republished in this country, in regard to the spurious flint hatchets and human fossil found at Abbeville, in France. Dr. Falconer and Mr. Prestwich were foremost, among others, in exposing this cruel hoax, to the great annoyance and discomfiture of Lyell, who was committed to it. A fact then transpired, which may serve to account for his silence in regard to the above articles.

It seems that Sir Charles, who was a convert to Mr. Horner's views, was induced to believe, from the depth at which the above pottery was found, that it must have been buried some 15,000 years ago. But before he had fully committed himself, by adding this new *proof* of a pre-Adamite man to the present volume, then in readiness for the press, he was informed by Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, that the marks of the Greek honeysuckle, discovered on some of the fragments, *clearly indicated an age not exceeding 200 years prior to the Christian era.*

The discovery of this Grecian pottery has established, conclusively, two very important points,—first, the worthlessness of this testimony of the Nile mud, in regard to the antiquity of man, and secondly, the unsoundness, or at least the unreliableness of Lyell's pet theory, when applied to any question of absolute chronology.

The evidence of the Nile mud would seem, at first sight, to be conclusive, in establishing the pre-Adamite antiquity of man. The case is remarkably free from those suppositions and assumptions, which almost universally characterize speculations on this subject. An ancient piece of pottery is admitted to have been found at a certain depth in the Nile mud. The present rate of increase of this deposit, from existing causes, being ascertained or granted, the only thing assumed is, the correctness of Lyell's theory of gradual and *uniform* deposition; the depth, therefore, of the superincumbent mud being measured, the age of the pottery was determined by a simple sum in arithmetic, and fixed at 15,000 years. Already, timid Christians began to fear for the fate of the Bible; but needlessly. Sir Gardiner Wilkinson turns over the piece, and discerns marks which determine its age as certainly as if it had been recorded in figures, and which prove that this pottery is not over 2,000 years old. What now becomes of the evidence that man is 30,000 years old, drawn from (Roman) red burnt brick, found at every depth in the Nile mud, and which Lyell attempts to prove to be *not* Roman brick, solely from the fact that Mr. Birch has a small rectangular piece of baked clay, *supposed*, by the style of art and inscription, to be as old as about 1450 B. C. ? It becomes mere *chaff*, without a single kernel of wheat.

There could not possibly be any more favorable formation for applying this theory of Lyell's. This pottery was not found, like most of his other relics, in drift or transported matter, bearing indisputable marks of disturbance ; but it was taken from the homogeneous and uniform *composition* of a river deposit. Yet its testimony, interpreted by this theory, does not even approximate to the truth. The error lies in assuming that the *rate*, as well as the composition of this deposit, has always been uniform ; or to express Lyell's theory in his own words, "that it has been formed very gradually, and by the *uniform* action of the same causes" now existing.

Now Lyell must admit, either that his theory is unsound in principle, or that it is unreliable in its application to *absolute chronology*, in consequence of unknown contingencies, or because the mean ratio of increase of a deposit, involving thousands of years, can never be obtained by the most diligent observation of existing causes during a life-time. He is constantly forced to admit, that existing causes may have acted with different degrees of energy at different times, and this implies such a modified presentation of his theory, as renders it inapplicable to the question of the absolute time required for a given formation. Admitting that the formation has been gradual, and due to the constant action of existing causes, yet the varying intensity of these causes during past ages, to say nothing of disturbing accidents, must always remain an unknown quantity. We might just as well attempt to determine the quantity of rain that has fallen during the previous century, by observations confined to a single day, as to try to estimate the deposit of a shifting river during thousands of years, by the most accurate observations of a life-time.

There is nothing stated in regard to the antiquity of the Ohio Mounds, which require notice ; but the remarks made in connection with the Mounds of Brazil, respecting "certain human bones imbedded in a solid rock," demand a passing comment.

Lyell tells us, that he first imagined the deposit containing them to be of submarine origin ; but that he has long ceased to entertain that opinion. Then, after reading Dr. Meigs'

Memoir, he "at first concluded that the whole deposit had been formed beneath the waters of the sea, or at least that it had been submerged after its origin, and again upheaved." But, on reading Dr. Meigs a second time, he has now no doubt that the deposit containing these bones, "may have been bound together into a solid stone, by the infiltration of the carbonate of lime." Here he confesses to the formation of several distinct hypotheses, involving supposed submerges and upheavals, to account for a simple, and by no means uncommon instance of petrification. We cannot help suspecting, that he was finally directed to the last solution, by the fact that the boasted pre-Adamite stone man, of Guadaloupe, turned out to be a comparatively modern petrified Indian. Such confessions are instructive, to show what little reliance is to be placed in the hypotheses of scientific men, whose proper business is always to observe and record facts, rarely to generalize, and never to speculate.

His remarks respecting the delta of the Mississippi, are exceedingly brief, but quite startling. From the depth of its deposits of several hundred feet, the immense extent of its area, the annual discharge of the river, and the mean annual amount of solid matter contained in its waters, he conjectures that the antiquity of the existing delta to be, "probably, more than 100,000 years." He states that a Dr. Dowler, whose opinion he quotes from Nott, who received it from somebody else, has calculated the antiquity of a human skeleton "of the Red Indian race," which was found sixteen feet below the surface of this deposit of several hundred feet, to be just 50,000 years old! Our brief reply is, be the age of the delta what it may, Dr. Dowler's calculation of the age of a red Indian's skeleton, found sixteen feet below its surface, is too wild for serious consideration. If the Dr. looks sharply about him, he will find relics of the present white race, buried still deeper beneath the swashed deposits of the Mississippi.

The next subject considered is, some fossil human remains, found by Count Pourtales, "in a *calcareous conglomerate*," forming part of the Florida coral reef, "supposed, by Agassiz, in accordance with his mode of estimating the rate of growth of those reefs, to be about 10,000 years old." The inference

suggested is, that the said bones are 10,000 years old ; but the truth is, they were imbedded in this calcareous conglomerate, and fossilized, in the same manner and by the same causes which operated to produce the stone man of Gaudaloupe, as well as the fossil remains of Santos, and are, probably, of more recent origin.

The remainder of this chapter is occupied in speculations regarding the assumed upheaval of the post-tertiary strata of part of Scotland, Cornwall, Sweden and Norway. It contains nothing that has any direct bearing on the question of man's age, though it indirectly suggests and insinuates his great antiquity. It furnishes, however, a very valuable argument to show the unsoundness of inferences which are frequently drawn in the subsequent part of the book, and exhibits, forcibly, what slender foundations our author requires for his generalizations and speculations in regard to time.

The fact that the sea has retired from the East and West coasts of Scotland, leaving bare a deposit of estuarine silt, on the margin of the present estuaries of the Forth and Clyde, is accounted for by a supposed upheaval of twenty-five feet, in the central district of the country, though it may have been due to another cause. According to Lyell, this upheaval was gradual and insensible, though he admits it may have been intermittent ; and yielding to the force of Mr. Geikie's reasoning, he also concedes that the greater part, if not the whole of the elevation, has occurred since the Roman wall of Antoninus was built across this district. Buried in the silted sand and clay of the old coast line, there have been found, during the last eighty years, seventeen boats or canoes, an iron anchor, and other implements of iron, several skeletons of whales, with some pointed instruments of deer's horn. All the boats were found along the margin of the Clyde at Glasgow, five of them under the streets of the city, and twelve, a hundred yards back from the river. "In one of the canoes, a beautifully polished celt or axe of green stone was found ; in the bottom of another, a plug of *cork*."* Most of these boats were canoes, hewed out of a single log, with different degrees of skill, but

*This cork could only have been brought from Spain, or other countries occupied by the Romans.

two of them were built with planks, one of which, having the beak of an antique galley, and a stern like those of our own day, was "very elaborately constructed," having the planks fastened to ribs, with oaken pins, and "nails of some kind of metal."

These are the facts, and our author immediately applies them to the corroboration of his inevitable hypothesis of successive chronological ages. He speculates thus:—"Nearly all these ancient boats were formed out of a single oak stem hollowed out by blunt tools, probably stone axes, aided by the action of fire; a few were cut beautifully smooth, evidently with metallic tools." And he then jumps to the conclusion that "There can be no doubt that some of these buried vessels are of far more ancient date than others. Those most roughly hewn may be relics of the stone period; those more smoothly cut, of the bronze age; and the regularly built boat of Bankton may perhaps come within the age of iron." To meet the objection that all of them were found in the same deposit, huddled together within a very circumscribed area, he tells us that this "fact by no means implies that they belong to the same era," because in such deposits "there are changes continually in progress, brought about by the deposition, removal, and redeposition of gravel, &c." He enforces this point by a long quotation from M. Geikie, going to prove that in transported and shifted deposits, *juxtaposition is no proof of contemporaneous age*, but that the most ancient relics may be found in contact with others of comparatively recent origin. We accept this statement as entirely correct; and the value of it will be seen when we come to consider the inferences which our author draws from human relics found in juxtaposition with the bones of extinct animals.

To a practical observer, having no hobbies to ride, the above difference in these boats, instead of proving successive ages and races of men, would simply indicate difference of skill on the part of the rude inhabitants, during that era which immediately preceded and succeeded the Roman occupation of their country. Precisely similar differences may this day be seen on hundreds of bayous, creeks, and small rivers, on our southern coast, or on the far western tributaries of the Mississippi and Missouri. We may now see, side by side, the rude "*dug-out*"

of the negro, with its stone anchor tied with a hickory withe ; the better hewed canoe of the white man ; and the skiff of the Indian ; the plank scow of the plantation, with its big brass padlock (proof of a bronze age) ; and occasionally a regularly built row boat, with its iron anchor. If any one of the numerous streams, whose whole marine is of this description, should be silted up, as they frequently are by change of channel during excessive freshets, or by other causes which are continually working changes, and after seventeen centuries should be reëopened, some future Lyell would find proof infinitely stronger than any which this book contains, of three successive ages of stone, bronze, and iron. Should he have the same powers of *generalization* as our author, he might, like him, point to a solitary "small, round, and very thick skull" of the negro, then to the more "elongated form and larger size" of that of the Indian, and lastly to a solitary cranium of a buried white man, in proof that three distinct races of men successively dwelt on the banks of this little river, and during countless ages advanced progressively from barbarism to civilization. This is precisely what the present Lyell aims to prove by evidence far less strong than the above data would give him.

As a believer in Revelation, we plead no religious scruples in opposition to Lyell's doctrine. But as a believer in the truth of Science, we are decidedly opposed to receiving it upon such evidence as he offers. Science deals with *facts*, not fancies. Only let him *prove* the truth of his hypothesis in regard to man's beginning on this earth, and we will adopt it ; in the mean time, we hold it reasonable to *suppose* that no one but the Creator can reveal the secret of man's original state and the time of his creation.

We have not yet quite finished with this third chapter. The author, following his usual practice throughout the book, seeks, at the conclusion of the chapter, to establish from the geological record some fixed data in regard to man's existence. By *supposing* and *assuming*, he makes some shells on a hill, 600 feet high, on the coast of Norway, to be just 24,000 years old, but he cannot find there any human relic. The upheaval of the deposit in Scotland, in which the boats were found, he admits "may have been subsequent to the Roman occupation."

"But," he adds, "the twenty-five feet rise is only the last stage of a long antecedent process of elevation;" for, as he goes on to tell us, "Mr. Smith of Jordenhill informs [him] that a rude ornament, made of cannel coal," has been found on the coast *fifty* feet above the water, among some gravel containing *marine shells*, which prove that this land was once covered by the sea.

On the strength solely of this information from Mr. Smith, he proceeds to establish the age of this marine sand hill, for the purpose of deducing from it the age of this ornament, which he assumes to be an ancient relic. He says:

"If we suppose the upward movement to have been uniform in central Scotland before and after the Roman age, and assume that as twenty-five feet indicate seventeen centuries, so fifty feet imply a lapse of twice that number, or 3400 years, we should then carry back the date of the ornament in question to fifteen centuries before our era, or to the days of Pharaoh and the period usually assigned to the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt."—p. 55.

We cite the above as a fair specimen of the kind of evidence and style of argument adopted throughout this book to prove the antiquity of man. The only *fact* in this case, is, that a piece of cannel coal, a mineral of not very ancient discovery,* fashioned into a ring or some other rude ornament, such as boys, in a cannel coal district, delight to whittle out of that material, was found on the surface of a marine sand hill 50 feet high. What legitimate connection is there between the date of this work of art, and the supposed age of the hill on which it was dropped? It presents in itself no marks of antiquity except its rudeness, and had it been whittled out and lost by some truant school-boy, which is the most reasonable supposition, a very few seasons would have sufficed to cover it with the loose gravel and sand in which it was found. Yet the date of this cannel coal ornament is carried back by *suppositions* and *assumptions* to the days of Pharaoh, and offered as an argument to prove the immense antiquity of man! The inference suggested very palpably, though not stated, is, that the Scots had begun to mine coal, and had made some progress in the æsthetic arts at "the period usually assigned to the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt."

* A bituminous substance called *ampelion*, from its use by the Greeks and Romans to anoint *vines*, is supposed by some to have been a species of cannel coal.

We are justified in concluding, from this case, that if some other Mr. Smith of Norway had informed our Author that a similar ornament had been found on the surface of the first mentioned marine sand hill of 600 feet high, he would have considered this information proof of the existence of a pre-Adamite 24,000 years ago, who had already advanced beyond the brutal state of the stone age, and also as furnishing evidence that the statements of Revelation in regard to the time of creation and original state of man are false.

Surely Napoleon uttered a profound truth when he said, "There are some men capable of believing every thing but the Bible."

Our limits will not permit us at present to continue the examination of this book ; the part which we have already examined, is, we think, the strongest, and we have seen on what a slender foundation of facts the Author relies to support his assumptions in regard to the antiquity of man and his primeval state of brutal savagism. So far as we have advanced in it, we find nothing to excite, in the most timid mind, a reasonable doubt of the usual acceptance of the chronology of the Bible taken in its narrowest sense, although we consider such an acceptance of it open to reasonable doubt.

The book seems to be written with candor and frankness, for, in the prolixity of its details, it does not omit facts and opinions very damaging to the views entertained, and which would almost furnish, to an observant reader, the means requisite for their refutation. Yet the author writes under such an evident bias, and avails himself so readily of the most trivial facts to make out a case, that he is obnoxious to the severest criticism consistent with strict justice, and ought not to complain of a rigid and jealous scrutiny of his opinions.

Time and opportunity serving, we propose, on a future occasion, to pursue the analysis of this book to the end ; then to turn the tables on these scientific skeptics, and show that the Bible, considered from a philosophical stand-point, is far more consonant with human reason than these "oppositions of science falsely so called," and vastly more entitled to belief than the fanciful hypotheses which have been offered as substitutes. "And this will we do, if God permit."

ART. II.—GENESIS OF SLANG AND STREET-SWEARING.

- (1.) *Dictionary of Slang.* JOHN CAMDEN HOLTEN, London : 1863.
- (2.) *Life and Writings of Major Jack Downing of Downingsvill.* Boston : 1834.
- (3.) *Clockmaker ; or the Sayings and Doings of Samuel Slick, of Slickville.* London : 1840.

CANT words, slang and profane swearing may be set down as three of those 'inventions'* which the Scripture says we have 'found out,' in place of our original 'uprightness.' They are devices of close kindred ; resulting either from defects of understanding or of speech. To improve an argument, we invent a term or twist a word ; and to enforce it, we add an oath. The practices have, therefore, a common origin ; and where not owing to a defective vocabulary, must be held as evidences of an imperfect or depraved intellect. Of these tricks, that of profane swearing is but too common among us ; and although the habit may have been somewhat curtailed in our day and within our recollection, still there is room for question, whether it really has suffered any other change than that of patronage ; and, whereas in former times it had been chiefly confined to men full-grown and in active life, it is now to be found more frequently among the idlers and the young ;—an unsavory indication that the religious discipline and education of our fathers was better than our own. That such is the case, may, we think, be inferred from a comparison of the habits of our ancestors, as recorded and transmitted to us, with what we are accustomed to see and hear every day now. In former times, it required a beard and a sword, to excuse, or give occasion for an oath ; but in our day, they greet us from lads in their sports, as well as in their quarrels, and a meer-

schaum and a curse hang, not unfrequently, on lips which have scarce done with school recitations. This, too, when such impieties are no longer tolerated in drawing-rooms, or in good society, and have not the influence of example in high places, to disguise their absurd and unnecessary wickedness.

We hold all kinds of slang, and street or common swearing, including even the somewhat less exceptionable technicals of fashionable life, to be trite wickednesses of the same family, only the more demoralizing because they are purposeless ; and therefore, in our opinion, every fashion either of writing or speaking, which tends to foster or excuse such improprieties, deserves distinct reprehension and discouragement. Now, of the many different sorts of books which come among us in modern times, there is one peculiar to our own age, which we believe to have a bad tendency in this respect, and the more so, because its influence is covert, and not directly appreciable. We allude to books written purposely in an imperfect, quaint, or vulgar idiom ; whose excellence as compositions must lie wholly in the accuracy of the imitation, and can be appreciable only by such as are familiar with the originals. In short, books which are made up of written mimicry, and have no purpose of instruction, except to make common thoughts ludicrous, by clothing them in imperfect or obsolete forms of speech. We have placed the title of certain works of this class at the head of our Article, not with any purpose of criticizing their merits, much less to accuse their authors of any purposed design against either good morals or good manners, but simply as samples of a kind of literature, the main object of which would seem to be, to hold up imperfect or peculiar dialects of our language to public ridicule, and to give vogue and currency to terms in themselves unusual, antiquated, idiomatic, or vulgar. We refer to them merely in the light of unintentional fabricators or purveyors of cant and slang, and in this wise, aimless auxiliaries to an evil practice.

In saying this, we would by no means be understood as objecting to the use either of idiom or dialect, when these become necessary adjuncts to any narrative. The Doric forms of Greek were often used with this intent, both in Comedy and

in Pastoral, even in the ripest age of that great people. In the last century, Burns gave expression and pathos to his lyrics, by singing—

"The loves; the ways of simple Scottish swains,"

in the rustic language and idiom of his country; and this, too, at a time when his countrymen, Hume, Robertson and Stewart, were earning laurels of a different kind in the higher fields of pure English literature. The Dramatists have all used this characteristic in their portraitures, although it must be noticed that the greatest masters have done so with the most sparing hand. In Shakespeare we have very little of it. The Welsh of Fluellen; the Scotch of Captain Jamie; and the French of Doctor Caius, are the only specimens of dialect; and Corporal Nym and his fellows, the only characters in which slang is made a principal feature. In our own day, Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray, have all used dialect in their descriptions; all of them, too, with great effect. Yet we have often questioned, whether Scott's most delicate touches of this kind could have ever been fairly understood by his readers in the sister kingdom; and the time seems fast approaching, when they will require both time and study to be appreciated by his own countrymen. Now, whatever may be its effect upon our contemporaries, it is evident that the use of a peculiar or obsolete dialect, must always be an imperfection with those readers who are to come after us. For we have no idea that a Glossary can ever be a convenience. So far, therefore, as traits of this sort may be necessary in elucidating character or aiding description,—though even then they are a great bar to any writer's chances at immortality,—we do not deem them entirely inadmissible. They are only so, when, instead of a mean, they become the sole end and purpose of any literary effort, and thus lead to the accumulation of a senseless and often-times wicked jargon. Many of us will remember how frequent the oath, 'by the eternal,' came into common conversation, shortly after the publication of Major Jack Downing's book: and this is only one example of the influence which we are now deprecating.

Exclamations are of course necessary, in all kinds of intercourse with our fellows. They are the parts of speech which

we have in common with inferior animals ; and it would be well for us, if in our moods of strong passion, we could always confine ourselves to the simple cries, which on such occasions serve the turn of our four-footed vassals :—

“ Oh that I were
Upon the hills of Basan ; to outroar
The horned herd ! For I have savage cause ; ”

is a considerate speech for one in a fury of anger or of jealousy, and contains a strong hint that an outcry is safer than an imprecation. Indeed, we see not why it might not be appropriate, as a part of education in the primary schools, to collect, systematize, and prepare, as a separate head of study, all the interjectional part of the language, so that fitting and innocent exclamations should be constantly at hand for any emergency of mental excitement, with authorities for their appropriate use. An analysis and arrangement of all terms of this class, from the simple Oh ! Oh me ! Oh dear ! Ah ! Ha ha ! Alas ! Indeed ! Bless us ! and such like, up to the more elaborate expressions of vexation, grief or agony might stop the vent of much future blasphemy. If it were made the *ton* to use one exclamation, when a man lost his way, and another when he found it, and so for some other of the principal accidents of life, the worst oaths would disappear gradually from common use, and swearing be discontinued, if not for the sacrilege, at least for the bad English.

We have called cant and slang an invention ; and we think it is this quality which makes its principal attraction. We have also sometimes thought that the swearing part of it may, in the olden time, have been considered, by people of rank, as a sort of privilege or royalty ; as if the quality of the swearer could take away the vanity of the oath. Hence would naturally arise the practice of swearing ‘ strange oaths.’ Henry of Lancaster would not use the same imprecation as Richard of York ; or Louis of France, as Philip of Burgundy. We know, indeed, that such was the case, and some of the early historians record the habitual oaths of their sovereigns, as if they had been acts of state ; sayings to be remembered, as characteristic and national. Some of the royal oaths were, doubtless,

modified, to avoid the profanity,—this being the inventive part of the process. 'Odds fish ; 'oddsblood ; 'dzounds ; had, evidently, their first letters clipped with some such pious motive, while others, of more recondite construction, may have been originally contrived with the same intention. It is conceivable, also, that the quality and fashion of the oath would vary, according to the habits and manner of living of the swearer. Beef and beer would enforce coarser outbreaks of this kind, than claret and macaroni. The maids of honor of Queen Elizabeth, who breakfasted on the first named viands, could not be expected to use either very pretty or very delicate say-words. The plainer diet might, possibly, have the advantage in this, that if the profanity were always coarse, it would, most generally, be simple ; whereas the more elaborate regimen might, now and then, beget expressions of abstruse sacrilege, shocking to unpractised ears. Indeed, from some passages in the earlier chronicles, we might suppose that oaths, in those times, were contrived and studied with as much care as battle-words and heraldic inscriptions. We find, in Shakespeare's Henry IV., Hotspur, instructing his gentle Kate in the proprieties of swearing, thus :—

“Not yours in good-sooth ! Heart, you swear like a comfit-maker's wife ! Not you in good-sooth ; and, as true as I live ; and as God shall mend me ; and as sure as day :

And giv'st such sarcenet surety for thy oaths,
As if thou never walk'dst farther than Finsbury.—
Swear me, Kate, like a lady as thou art,
A good mouth-filling oath ; and leave in sooth
And such protest of pepper gingerbread,
To velvet guards and sunday citizens.”

From the same Play we learn that this vice was accounted extremely unbecoming in youth.

“Swear'st thou, ungracious boy !”

Says the prince, in the mock scene where he personates his father ; as if the reprimand had been one to which he was accustomed.

That the habit of profane swearing is now more common than formerly among the young, and less so among the old, is,

we think, evident from sundry historical passages that have come to us from the earlier times. In the works of fiction written two centuries ago, and which are now accredited as fair specimens of the manners of those days, oaths are put, not only in the mouths of bravadoes, soldiers, sailors and drabs, but also find place in the conversation of men of worship and station. We find also that the divines of that period, in arguing against the practice, are not satisfied with condemning it as an offense against the Divine command,—which in all Christian communities should be the strongest argument,—but press also the further reason, that it is indecent, unnecessary, and uncivil. All which is strong intimation that the practice obtained in high life, as well as in low, and differed only in style. The two following passages, from Sermons of Barrow and Tillotson, give proof that the habit was very prevalent in their day:—

“Some vain persons take it for a genteel and graceful thing, a special accomplishment, a mark of fine breeding, a point of high gallantry; for who, forsooth, is the brave spark, the complete gentleman, the man of conversation and address, but he that hath the skill and confidence (oh heavens! how mean a skill! how mad a confidence) to lard every sentence with an oath or a curse; making bold, at every turn, to salute his Maker, or to summon Him in attestation to his tattle; not to say, calling and challenging the Almighty to damn and destroy him? Such a conceit, I say, too many have of swearing, because a custom thereof, together with divers other fond and base qualities, hath prevailed among some people, bearing the name and garb of gentlemen.”

This from Barrow; and from Tillotson we have what follows:—

“For common swearing, (if it have any serious meaning at all,) argues in a man a perpetual distrust of his own reputation, and is an acknowledgment that he thinks his bare word not to be worthy of credit. And it is so far from adorning and filling a man's discourse, that it makes it look more swollen and bloated, and more bold and blustering than becomes persons of gentle and good breeding. Besides that, it is a great incivility, because it highly offends and grates upon all sober and considerate persons; who cannot be presumed, with any manner of ease and patience, to hear God affronted, and His great and glorious name so irreverently tost upon every slight occasion.”

We class slang and common swearing as inventions, because we conceive the main gratification of indulging in such pastime must consist in the power we have of varying, from time to time, the formula, so that by some fancy of the swearer, like the additional screw of a new patent, he can obtain a privilege in it for himself. And, viewing it in this light, we believe that in the earlier times, this property of invention was principally used to avoid the profanity. At first, it was only accounted a breach of the third commandment, when we called God to witness, by any of His well-known names or titles. It was the personality which constituted the sin, and a simple damn, without the prefix, was only a vulgarism, and not a profanity. Indeed, it seems to be the understanding among some people even now, that all impiety is avoided, if the holy name be not uttered, but only left to be understood, or some word of similar sound put in its place. At any rate, the charm of the practice would seem to be, that we can appropriate it by some addition or variation. Hence parts and properties would take the place of person, and the attributes of the Almighty come to be used instead of His name. This was, doubtless, the origin of such French oaths as, *Teste Dieu ! Paquez Dieu !* where, in process of time, the first word only usurped the place of the whole formula ; while the English oaths, *God's blood ! God's wounds !* which are recorded as royal profanities, were at last changed to *'odd's blood ! 'zounds !* by amputation at the other end. As the number of canonized saints increased, men began to swear by them. Each man, as we may suppose, choosing the name of his patron saint, as the one with whom he had the best right to be familiar. This phase of swearing, now nearly obsolete, was a decided improvement ; avoiding the sacrilege, while committing the sin. To be sure, our theory of accounting for such changes, is simply our own, and advanced barely for the reason that—

“ It is joy to think the best
We can of human kind.”

A singular characteristic of the vice of common swearing is, that it should have been so long punishable by the statute-law

in all Christian countries, and yet have retained its place so long, or to so great an extent, among persons of any character or standing. The worship and reverence due to God, which is so strongly inculcated in all forms of the Christian dispensation, was by no means unknown or unfelt among the heathen ; for in Rome, the priests of Jupiter were forbidden to swear by their God, even before the tribunals. In this respect the religion of Mahomed presents, we believe, the only exception. For it would seem to be a recognized custom among the Moslem, to use the name of God, in the commonest forms of daily intercourse with each other. So that Allah, in some one of its combinations, is of constant and reiterated occurrence ; leaving it to be inferred, that this sin had not been considered in the scheme of the Arabian prophet.

If the hypothesis we set out with be well grounded, that the zest of cant, slang and swearing, is the pleasure arising from the exercise of our invention, in coining words and mincing phrases, there will immediately appear a rational and stronger ground for the prevalence of the practice ;—one against which it will be useful to provide an antidote. It requires but scant knowledge of human nature to make us aware, that the introduction of a new word, or the new application of an old one, is itself a very considerable achievement and gratification. Not long since, the man who first used the word '*telegram*,' instead of '*telegraphic dispatch*,' reclaimed the honor in a public letter, written with considerable heat and sense of wrong, against some modern impostor, who would have 'put it in his pocket.' And we have read, not very long since, of a chaplain, who, in a like public manner, redeemed his property in a quotation. He had used it, we believe, in a prayer made before the Senate of the United States, and some other person found it apposite for a toast at a public dinner. There had been an interval of some dozen years between the two applications. Notwithstanding, the clergyman insisted on his prior right, by an appeal to the public. The youngster who, at the beginning of the rebellion, may have volunteered as a soldier from Indiana or from Maine, would be apt, in writing home of his first successful achievement in arms, to say that we had

beaten the rebels, and that they had retreated. In his next dispatch, or soon after, he would probably communicate the same intelligence in the slang of the camp, and announce that we had *whipped secesh* and he had *skedadled*;—two of the important words in the last letter, having been just adopted in the fighting vocabulary.

Thus we see that the invention of new words, or the appropriation of old ones to new uses, is by no means a slight or unvalued gratification. It is certainly a bit of progress,—fruit gathered from our habitual associations, and like all such fruit, often unripe and unwholesome. The youth who has been accustomed to hear the name of God uttered only on solemn occasions, and to use it himself only in his catechism or his prayers, finds something piquant and exciting, when it comes with emphasis into an asseveration, or an opinion, and it soon opens the road for kindred expletives. Conceit is the first fountain of slang and common swearing, for we believe that wanton profanity, even among the worst of people, is very rare.

This practice of word-making, which is constantly going on in all modern languages, is what contributes mainly to their instability. As long as they are living tongues, used in the common intercourse among men, they are variable, and, like those who use them, only become positively fixed after they are dead. So it was by no means a vain pedantry, which induced philosophers and theologians to carry on their disputations in Latin, long after that language had ceased to be a general dragoman and interpreter between the learned of different nations. Its words had acquired fixed values, which could not be the case in our own tongue. And indeed, constantly, the best defined words in any language are those which have been derived from others. The changes effected in this manner, by the incorporation of foreign words, or the technical meanings which attach themselves to words of the mother tongue, are so gradual, that we are scarce aware of them, until they have become fixed upon us. Still, the whole quantity of alteration produced in half a century, or a life-time, is quite perceptible. As instances, we may mention, that the words *raid* and *foray*, which, at the commencement of the Rebellion,

were only known by their uses in Scott's romances, signifying there, a *ride*, or a *foraging* expedition, have now become technical in military science, and found their way into official despatches. We remember the time when the words *inaugurate*, *prestige*, *programme*, *resumé*, were rarely used and scarcely understood. To say we were going to inaugurate a policy or a statue, would have been accounted affected and grandiloquent. Now, this is a common use of the word, and has an accepted signification, namely, that the statue is to be set up, or the policy commenced, with music and speeches. If the translators of the Bible had used this word in describing the dedication of the Temple, or of Nebuchadnezzar's Image in the plain of Dura, the signification would have been, for many years, outside of the public apprehension. But now, all these words have found their places in English Dictionaries, which books have already become so large and ponderous, that we fancy a new term will soon be necessary in Bibliography, to designate the size of the volume, (cubo instead of quarto,) and certain mechanical contrivance, like lifts and braces, invented, to enable people of ordinary strength to handle them. Unless, indeed, lexicographers and compilers should betake themselves, all at once, to the opposite course of retrenchment and abridgment. In which case, we might expect to meet, before long, advertisements like the following :—"For sale, a complete Dictionary of the English Language, containing all words necessary in maintaining an intelligible conversation on any subject whatever ; price 20 cents." The unnatural size to which our English Dictionaries have recently been swollen, has arisen from the attempt to make them contain all the terminology of all the arts and all the sciences, or to collect into one volume the definitions which formerly were to be found only in Encyclopedias. The attempt cannot, we think, be successful, or if so, will only tend to increase the knowledge of names, with but faint and vague ideas of the things to which they belong ;—adding to the wordiness of the age, without any proportionate accession of information.

If we have not been too fanciful in laying down our premises, and have not too much overstrained them in the applica-

tion, then the publication of books of the class we have mentioned, such as *Major Downing*, *Sam Slick*, including also some of the funnier mimics of Hood and Moore, can have no other operation than to impair the dignity of authorship, disturb the stability and equilibrium of the language, and increase the quantity of cant and slang, the production of which last is generally much in excess, even in ordinary times and from natural causes. We can readily conceive, that in some kinds of composition, the homelier dialects or idioms of the language, may be of great use, in giving both strength and plainness to the descriptions. In many passages from the modern authors which we have mentioned, where such expedients have been resorted to, the presentations have thus been rendered more lifelike and impressive. But, be it remembered, that in all such cases, the perfection of the recital and the pleasure which it gives, can be great only in proportion to our knowledge of the terms used; and when this is limited, or lacking altogether, or becomes cloudy, by means of quaint or curious modifications, the charm has lost one of its principal ingredients. It is also to be held in mind, that this knowledge of the imperfect or provincial dialects of our own time, so necessary in properly appreciating this sort of writing, will be either wanting altogether, or present in very small proportion, in the generation that is to follow us. It may be urged, that most or all of the books we have mentioned, were not intended to fill any high place in the National Literature, or emulous of becoming a permanent part of it. But, admitting this,—and, also, that such an admission would be agreeable to their authors,—it by no means allays or abates the evils resulting from its use to the readers of our own time.

Of the many provincial dialects found in the British Isles, it is singular, and we suppose in a great measure owing to accident, that the Scotch has, up to our own time, retained so high a place in public estimation. The other modifications of English, used in Yorkshire, Northumberland, Cornwall, Wales and Ireland, are all as peculiar, as rich and as musical as the Scotch; yet, with the exception of some roundelays of Chaucer, Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*, a few songs, confined mostly to

their particular districts, and some strong caricatures in the Comedies and Fictions of the day, there is no book, neither story nor poem, written in either of these dialects, which is likely to descend to future times. While, at the same time, it seems clear, that the general verdict, both of English as well as Scotch, will award the meed of immortality both to Ramsay and to Burns. No one doubts but that the *Gentle Shepherds*, and the *Cotter's Saturday Night*, will be read in ages yet to come, with glossaries and annotations as dark and as copious as any that have ever yet been heaped upon the texts of any classics of former times. For in relation to commentators, we have long made up our minds, that no man of sense and talent ever wrote or will write notes for publication, on any text which he thoroughly understands. The popularity and preservation of the two Scotch pastorals, the *Gentle Shepherds* and the *Cotter's Saturday Night*, have no doubt depended, in no small degree, upon two great historic occurrences;—the Reformation, and the Rebellion of 1640. Nor is it any disparagement to suppose, that all great national Poems have derived much of the spice and flavor in which they have been preserved, from their connection with important events occurring about the times in which they have been written.

It seems a matter well decided by experience, that in certain kinds of poetry, as for instance in the Patriotic Songs and Pastorals of a country, the introduction of some of the older and more primitive words of a language, adds always zest and body to the composition; just as it is said the nobler wines are improved in flavor by a slight admixture from the lees of an older tun. Nor is it easy to judge how much of this material will suffice to produce exactly the most generous and racy liquor. But we know that without some such quaint or old-fashioned ingredient, all pastoral poetry becomes tame and passionless,—an imitation and a mock. For in truth, with the exception of Spenser, Ramsay and Burns, all the rest of the English poetry called by the name of Pastoral, is merely the nonsense of well educated gentlemen and ladies, who talk of sheep and kine, and love and butter, just as people would do, whose

principal knowledge of wool had been acquired from broad-cloth, and of milk, through the medium of coffee or of punch.

As samples of the effect of this admixture of dialect in the higher order of poetry, we extract three passages from Scott, Burns and Spenser. The subjects are very much alike in each, and treated in the same manner. The first, taken from Scott, is perfect English. It is the first part of Roderick's Vision, in the Hall of Destiny.

"For they might spy, beyond that mighty breach,
Realms as of Spain, in visioned prospect laid;
Castles and towers, in due proportion each,
As by some skillful Artist's hand pourtrayed:
Here, crossed by many a wild sierra's shade,
And boundless plains that tire the traveller's eye,
There, rich with vineyard and with olive glade
Or deep embrowned with forests huge and high;
Or washed by mighty streams that slowly murmured by.

"And here, as erst upon the antique stage,
Passed forth the bands of masquers trimly led
In various forms and various equipage,
While fitting strains the hearer's fancy fed:
So to Don Roderick's eye, in order spread,
Successive pageants filled that mystic scene,
Showing the fate of battles, ere they bled,
And issue of events that had not been
And ever and anon strange sounds were heard between."
Vision of Don Roderick.

The second is from one of Burns' finest pieces, and has only three words of Scotch in it. It is the description of Coila's Mantle:—

"Deep lights and shades bold mingling threw
A lustre grand,
And seemed, to my astonished view,
A well known land.

Here, rivers in the sea were lost;
There, mountains to the sky were tost:
Here, tumbling billows marked the coast
With surging foam;
There, distant shone Art's lofty boast,
The lordly dome.

Here Doon poured down his far-fetched floods;
 There well fed Irwine stately *thuds*;
Auld hermit Ayr *staw* through his woods,
 On to the shore,
 And many a lesser torrent scuds
 With seeming roar.

* * * *

By stately tower or palace fair
 Or ruin, pendant in the air,
 Bold stems of heroes here and there
 I could discern:
 Some seemed to muse; some seemed to dare
 With feature stern."

The Vision.

The third is from the Faerie Queene. It sings the bridal of the Thames and Medway, bringing into the spousal train all the other English rivers, and painting their natural and historic characteristics. It is studded thick with old English words:—

"So went he playing on the watery plaine;
 Soone after whom the lovely Bridegroome came,
 The noble Thames, with all his goodly traine.
 But him before there went, as best became
 His auncient parents, namely th' auncient Thame:
 But much more aged was his wife than he,
 The Ouze, whom men do Isis rightly name;
 Full weake and crooked creature seemed shee,
 And almost blind through eld that scarce her way could see.

Therefore on either side she was sustained
 Of two small groms, which by their names were hight
 The Churne and Charwell, two small streams, which pained
 Themselves her footing to direct aright,
 Which failed oft through faint and feeble plight:
 But Thame was stronger, and of better stay;
 Yet seemed full aged by his outward sight
 With head all hoary and his beard all gray,
 Deawed with silver drops that trickled downe alway:

* * * *

But he their Sonne full fresh and lolly was,
 All decked in a robe of watchet hew,
 On which the waves, glittering like christall glas,
 So cunningly enwoven were, that few
 Could weenen whether they were false or trew:
 And on his head like to a coronet
 He wore, that seemed strange to common vew,

In which were many towres and castles set,
That it encompass round as with a golden fret.

* * * * *

And round about him many a pretty Page
Attended duly, ready to obey,
All little Rivers which owe vassalage
To him as to their Lord, and tribute pay ;
The chaulky Kenet; and the Thetis gray ;
The morish Cole; and the soft-sliding Breane ;
The wanton Lee, that oft doth loose his way ;
And the still Darent, in whose waters cleane
Ten thousand fishes play and decke his pleasant streame.

Then came his neighbour Floods which nigh him dwell,
And water all the English soile throughout ;
They all on him this day attended well,
And with meet service waited him about :
No one disdained low to him to lout :
No not the stately Severne grudged at all,
Ne storming Humber, though he looked stout ;
But both him honored as their principall.
And let their swelling waters low before him fall.

Faerie Queene, Book IV.

We have placed these passages together, (though the books themselves are known to all readers,) for the sake of showing how an admixture of old, provincial or unused words, such as have retained their first associations, may be brought with effect into more modern composition, and thus strengthen and restore a language after it has been too much wasted and expended by common use. But the most marked instance of the influence upon a whole people, of a revival of the older idioms and peculiarities of a language, is found in the history of Jasmin, the popular poet of Guienne, in France, who died but recently. He was a barber, practising that humble occupation at his native town of Agen on the Garronne, and his first book, entitled *les Papillotes*, was published in Paris, in 1835. The revival, at that time, of the old dialect of Provence, the langue d' Oc, excited a great sensation throughout all France. And the poet, who also recited his verses in public, was received everywhere with expressions of admiration, sufficient to have turned the head of any ordinary person. Our Scotch and Irish dialects are easy, compared with the troubadour language thus

reproduced, one peculiarity of which is the substitution, almost constantly, of the *b*, for the *v*, and the heaping up of vowels long unwritten and unsounded in Modern French. We give a single distich as example :—

Cependen lou ten fuch : Durens lou campanayre
De nou truts cadancats fazio retenti l' aÿre
Quand l' aouroro fourrado en raoubo de sati
Desfarouillo sans brut las portos del mati.

Its modern equivalent being :—

Cependant le temps fuit ; Durand, le sonneur de cloches
De neuf coups cadencés faisait retentir l' air,
Quand l' aurore, Fourrée en robe de satin,
Déverronille sans bruit les portes du matin.

Those who have ever listened, in these later days, to the big-mouthed, many voweled speech of the North of England, will have some idea of what sort of influence such a dialect, well articulated, must have had upon modern Frenchmen. But it was not only his verses, but his manner of life and conversation, which endeared Jasmin to his neighbors in the South of France. He considered his business of barber as his proper and legitimate vocation, and practised it at Agen, to the end of his life, distributing his gains as an author, which are said to have been very large, among the public and private charities of the kingdom. He may be said to have divided with Beranger the honor of being, for his age, the popular poet of France. Using his powers of imagination and of song to delight all the provencal region, where the language is still spoken, at the same time that to the accredited French critics at the capital, its revival was full of glorious and healthful memories, as the language of the Troubadours, and of Henry of Navarre. The following critical remarks, made by Jasmin in his own shop, about the year 1830, will serve to show the character of this modern bard of an old school. Speaking of modern French, he said that it had been spoiled :—

* “ You could no more write poetry in French now, than you could in arithmetrical figures, The language had been licked and kneaded,

* Claret and Olives, from the Garonne to the Rhone.

and tricked out and plumed, and dandified and scented, and ruled square and chipped, and pranked out and polished and muscaded, until, for all honest purposes of true, high poetry, it was mere unavailable and contemptible jargon. It might do for cheating *agents de Bourse*; for squabbling politicians in the Chambers; for mincing dandies in the *salons*; for the sarcasm of scriblish comedies, or the coarse drolleries of Palais Royal farces; but for poetry, the French language was extinct. All modern poets who used it were mere *faiseurs de phrase*, thinking about words and not feeling. No! No! to write poetry, you must get the language of a rural people,—a language talked among fields, and trees, and by rivers and mountains,—a language never minced or disfigured by academies and dictionary makers and journalists; you must have a language like that which your own Burns used; or like the brave old mellow tongue, unchanged for centuries, stuffed with the strongest, quaintest, richest, raciest idioms and old and solemn words, full of shifting meanings and associations, at once pathetic, familiar, homely and graceful; the language which I write in, and which has never yet been defiled by calculating men of science or a jack-a-dandy literateurs."

This is the substance of a conversation held between a correspondent of the London Morning Chronicle, and the poet of Agen, sometime in the winter of 1830; and in it there is, certainly, both truth and fervor.

But it is one thing to adopt the more earnest and ancient idioms of a language, for the sake of their plainness or their strength, or the affection which certain classes of the people may bear them, and quite another to select vulgarisms and slang; that, too, which has but recently been coined on the hustings, in the boxing ring, or on 'change, for the purpose of exhibiting ridiculous peculiarities of talk, and giving them a currency and a vogue in places where they would otherwise never have come. Take for instance the following N. B. from Sam Slick, which is about as harmless a specimen as we have been able to select.

P. S. *Keep dark.*

"If you have a real right down clipper of a horse in your stable a doing of nothing, could'nt you jist whip over to Portland on the 20th, to meet me in your waggon? If you could, I can put you up to a thing about oils, in which, I think, we could make considerable of a decent spec, and work it so as to turn a few thousand dollars slick. General Corncob will accommodate me at the bank with what we want, for it was me helped him over the fence, when he was non-plushed last election for Senator by the Democratic Republicans, and he must be a most superfine infernal rascal, if he turns stag on me

now. Chaw on it at any rate, and if you have a mind to go snacks, why jist make an errand for something or another to the bay, to draw the wool over folks' eyes, and come on the sly, and you will go back heavier, I guess, than you came, by a plaguy long chalk, that's a fact."

SAM SLICK.

We are sure we cannot be wrong in our premises, that slang and profanity are kindred and debasing habits, though we may not have been quite successful in proving that the species of buffo writing to which we have referred has, in times past, greatly contributed to their increase. In the present unrestrained license of the press, there is no power to control it for good, except the censure of public opinion, and the critical authority of publicists themselves. We have endeavored to add our small mite of influence, in the right direction, and thus take leave of the subject.

ART. III.—LETTERS ON ROMISH ERRORS AND CORRUPTIONS.

LETTER II.

TO THE REV. T. W. COIT, D. D., LL. D.,
Rector of St. Paul's Church, Troy, New York.

MY DEAR DOCTOR:—

IN my previous Letter, I have shown how fundamentally the Modern Church of Rome differs from the Church of Primitive and Apostolic times, in its Organization, Ministry, and Government. I come now to describe another, and not less important feature of that Church ;—I mean, its Doctrines and Discipline ; everything, in short, which constitutes the Inner Life of that System. If we have found reasons before for rejecting Modern Romanism, the Errors and Corruptions which I am now to describe must deepen that aversion, in the estimation of every candid and conscientious Christian.

V.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE ROMISH CHURCH IS
 GUILTY OF GROSS IDOLATRY IN HER WORSHIP.

That the Idolatry of which the Romish Church is guilty, is contrary to Holy Scripture, and to the practice of the Church in the first five Centuries, I do not deem it necessary to prove. That it is thus contrary, is demonstrable.* All that I am now to show is, that the Romish Church is fairly chargeable with this confessedly enormous sin. Her writers and learned doctors attempt to make a distinction between what they term, *Latria* and *Dulia* ; the former being the worship due only to God ; the latter, the reverence paid to inferior objects. In the first place, this is a wire-drawn distinction, which the common people are not capable of apprehending. In the next place, the

* The reader will find all the evidence he needs in J. E. Tyler's *Worship of the Virgin Mary*. London: 1851, 8vo. pp. 425.

Worship which is actually offered in that Church, is, as a matter of fact, grossly idolatrous. To exhibit the full enormity of this sin, we need to quote at length ; we can give only brief specimens. Take the following, from the Psalter of Bonaventura, published at Rome under the auspices of Pope Sixtus V., and between A. D. 1476 and 1823, passing, it is said, through twenty-eight Editions :—

“Blessed is the man that loveth thy name, Oh Holy Virgin Mary, thy grace shall strengthen his soul.”*

“We praise thee, the Mother of God,—we acknowledge thee Mary the Virgin.”†

“To thee the whole angelic creation, with never ceasing voice, cry aloud.”‡

“Holy, Holy, Holy, Mary, the Parent of God, Mother and Virgin.”

“Thou, *with thy Son*, sittest at the right hand of the Father.”§

“Oh Lady, save thy people, that we may be partakers of thy Son’s inheritance.”||

“Vouchsafe, Oh sweet Mary, to keep us now and forever without sin.”¶

“In thee do we hope, Oh sweet Mary, do thou defend us eternally.”**

We quote next from the “Glories of Mary,” by Alphonso Liguori, and approved by Pope Pius VII., A. D. 1803.

“Dispensatrix of the Divine Grace, *you save whom you please*, to you then I commit myself, that the enemy may not destroy me.”††

“We, Holy Virgin, hope for grace and Salvation from you, and since you need but say the word, Oh do so, and you shall be heard, and we shall be saved.”‡‡

The following extracts are made from a long prayer used by the “Confraternity of the Holy Scapular,” in Ireland.

“Oh Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel, dearest Mother of God, Queen of angels, Advocate of sinners, Comforter of the afflicted, extend, Oh glorious Virgin, the ear of your pity, to the prayers of me your most humble servant. Purify my heart, Oh immaculate Virgin, from every sin, take away and banish from me all, everything, that can offend your chaste eye,” &c., &c.”

In the Book of Devotions, usually known as “Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Mary”—the following are specimens of blasphemous addresses to the Virgin Mary.

* Psalm I.

† Ibid.

‡‡ P. 137.

† The “Te Deum.”

¶ Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

** Ibid.

§ Ibid

†† P. 100.

"Oh Holy Mother of God, Glorious Queen of Heaven and Earth! I choose thee this day for my Mother, my Queen, and my Advocate at the Throne of thy divine Son."*

"Oh Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen, as God the Son has endowed thee with so much knowledge and charity, *that it enlightens all Heaven*, so in the hour of our death, illustrate and strengthen our souls, with the knowledge of the true Faith, that they be not perverted by error or pernicious ignorance."†

We close this list of extracts, to which hundreds might be added from other sources, by selecting two or three from a Book of Devotions, called the "Month of Mary," and approved by an American Bishop.‡

"Obtain for me, Oh Glorious Virgin, a sincere conversion; strength and resolution in the hour of trial; and the Grace of final perseverance."§

"Oh Sacred Refuge of Sinners! How many sinners hast thou rescued from the power of Hell! How many hast thou brought over to penance and change of life."||

"Oh amiable and powerful Mother! Graciously assist us and rescue us from all misery and affliction. Protect the Church of thy Son, that her enemies may not prevail over her."¶

Disguise it as the Romanists may, such language is nothing more or less than that homage and worship paid to a finite creature, which belongs to the Supreme Majesty of Heaven;—for it implies the possession by the Virgin Mary of all the attributes and perfections of the Deity. It places her with the Son on the Throne of God, at the right hand of the Father on high. How different from all this is the manner in which our blessed Lord once spoke of His mother. It was told Him, on one occasion, that His mother and brethren were without, desiring to speak with Him. He replied, "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?" And He stretched forth His hand toward His *disciples*, and said, "Behold my mother and my brethren."***

The development of Idolatry in the Worship of the Blessed Virgin, has of late made rapid strides. In the Encyclical Letter of Pius IX., to which we have already alluded, see who it is that he places as Mediator at the right hand of the Father,

* P. 201.

§ P. 72.

† P. 212.

‡ P. 153.

‡ Bp. Francis Patrick Kenrick.

¶ P. 162.

** Matt. xii. 49, 50.

instead of that ONE MEDIATOR "Who ever liveth to make intercession for us."^{*}

Pius IX., says :—

"But, in order that God may accede more easily to our prayers and our wishes, and to those of all His faithful servants, let us employ, in all confidence, as our mediatrix with Him, the Virgin Mary, who has destroyed all heresies throughout the world, and who, the well-beloved Mother of us all, "is very gracious * * and full of mercy * * allows herself to be touched by all, shows herself very clement towards all, and takes under her pitying care all our miseries with unlimited affection,"—(St. Bernard, *Germ. du duodecim prerogativis B. M. V., on verbis Apocalypti*)—and who, sitting as Queen upon the right hand of her Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, in a golden vestment, shining with various adornments, knows nothing which she cannot obtain from the Sovereign Master."

Idolatry, as it is one of the most glaring, so it has ever been one of the most besetting sins of the Romish Church.

The Cardinal Bellarmine, in attempting to exalt the power of the Pope, as being above the Church, aims to prove, that all the names which in the Scriptures are given to Jesus Christ, ARE GIVEN TO THE POPE. We quote briefly from his work, *De Conc. et Eccl.* Book ii. Ch. 17.

"Thou art the Shepherd, thou art the Physician ; finally, thou art another God upon earth."

"We acknowledge the Supremacy of the Holy Father the LORD GOD THE POPE, and he is Peter's successor in the Chair."—

"We are bound to believe that Christ's Vicar, our LORD GOD THE POPE, can absolve all men, (heretics excepted,) and has given the like power to all his inferior Clergy."

Other epithets have been given him, as "The Saviour that was to come," as the "Lord's Christ," and others of equal profanity. At the tenth Session of the Fifth Lateran Council, in A.D. 1515, the following address was made to Pope Leo X.:—

"Seize, therefore, the two edged sword of DIVINE POWER delivered unto thee FOR ALL POWER IS GIVEN UNTO THEE, IN HEAVEN AND ON EARTH."[†]

In this feature of the Romish Church, then, we have the strongest possible reason why no conscientious Christian, who remembers how jealous God is of His honor, how fearfully He has guarded it by His threatenings, can or will dare be guilty

* Heb. vii. 25.

† Lab. et Cos. *Conc. tom. xiv. p. 271.*

of engaging in such Worship. Well may the genuine Catholics of France say :—

“We cannot but recognize, in the bosom of the Catholic Church, the existence of a sect, which has for its purpose the substitution for God and for His Christ, of the Virgin Mary. This sect, which saps the very corner-stone of Christianity, is already designated, and with justice, by the name of *Marianism*. The Marianists attribute to Mary the salvation and redemption of the world. According to them, nothing comes to mankind but by Mary. Mary, in their system, is a fourth person to the Trinity; in power and splendor she surpasses the Three, of whom, in fact, there is scarcely any mention in the journals of this sect.”*

And yet, as we have already seen, the leader of that Sect is the Pope himself !

VI.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE CHURCH OF ROME HAS ADDED NEW ARTICLES OF FAITH AS NECESSARY TO SALVATION.

Here is one of the weakest, least defensible, and worst points in the whole Romish system. In nothing has she more entirely forfeited her claim to genuine Catholicity. The American and Anglican Branches of the Church Catholic maintain, that—

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation ; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.”†

In their interpretation of Holy Scripture, and in deciding Articles of Faith, these Churches have simply taken the testimony of the men who wrote the New Testament, and who compiled the Articles of Faith, the things necessary to be believed, the “Form of sound words,” the APOSTLES’ CREED, and who published and preached that Creed, before a single word of the New Testament was written. And when, at the Council of Nice, that Creed was more distinctly and fully expressed and defined against the Early Heresies, not a single new Article of Faith was added. It was still, what Irenæus had before described ; “the Faith received from the Apostles and their disciples.”‡ “This rule,” Tertullian declares,

* *Observateur Catholique*, Vol. I. pp. 3, 52. Edit. Paris, 1845.

† Article VI.

‡ Iren. lib. i. Cap. 3.

"Christ did Institute." (*Tertull. de Præs. adv. Hær. c. 14.*) It was still "The Faith once delivered to the saints." The Faith being wholly a thing of divine origin and revelation, man can no more create, or change, or alter it in any one of its terms, than he can create a world. Here is where the American Church stands in bold contrast with both the extremes of Rome and Geneva. Presbyterianism and Congregationalism have changed the Faith, by substituting for the Ancient Creeds metaphysical subtleties, and so brought in those monstrous dogmas, of Limited Atonement, Unconditional Election, Eternal Reprobation, &c., &c.*

* The following Articles of Faith *all* Presbyterians are required most solemnly to profess their belief in, on joining that Communion :—

II.—Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass, upon all supposed conditions, yet hath He not decreed any thing, because He foresaw it as a future, or as that which would come to pass, upon such conditions.

III.—By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

IV.—These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

V.—Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace.

VI.—As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they, who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by His Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power, through faith, unto salvation. *Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.*

VII.—The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy, as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath, for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice.—*Pres. Confession of Faith, Philadelphia, 1827. pp. 16—19.*

The Confession of Faith adopted by "The Elders and Messengers of the Churches in the Colony of Connecticut, in New England, at Saybrook, September 9, 1708," contains the above Articles, *verbatim et literatim*. The "Elders and Mes-

The Church of Rome has fallen into a similar error, but in another way. Her rule for deciding Articles of Faith, is as follows :—

“Truth and Discipline are contained in Written Books and in Unwritten Tradition, which being received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Holy Spirit dictating to the Apostles, has reached even to us, as though it were transmitted by hand.”*

She thus substitutes for Primitive Testimony, Unwritten Tradition. And what that Unwritten Tradition is worth, through fifteen hundred such years as the Church passed through, it is not difficult to decide. Take her own practice in illustration of the above rule of interpretation. Take the Articles of Faith which the Church of Rome framed during the eighteen years of the famous Council of Trent. Take her *five* Canons on Original Sin ; her *thirty-three* Canons on Justification ; her *thirteen* Canons on the Sacraments ; her *fourteen* Canons on Baptism ; her *three* Canons on Confirmation ; her *eleven* Canons on the Eucharist ; her *fifteen* Canons on Penance ; her *four* Canons on Extreme Unction ; her *four* Canons on Communion, in both kinds ; her *nine* Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass ; her *eight* Canons on Orders ; her *twelve* Canons on the Sacrament of Matrimony,—and then take the Creed of Pope Pius IV., the very highest authority among Papists, and remember that every single one of these dogmas is not only to be believed, *but believed as an Article of Faith, on pain of eternal damnation*,—and then say, whether there is an intelligent man who can do this, without renouncing his manhood, his reason, his conscience, and his judgment. We

sengers of the Churches assembled in the Synod at Cambridge, in New England, adopted the same Confession, in June, 1648. Neither was this Confession original with them. It was, in respect to Doctrine, and in the points above quoted, identical with the Savoy Confession, adopted at London, in 1658, and with the Westminster Confession, presented to the Puritan Parliament, in March, 1648. The English Puritans had imbibed these Calvinistic theories, when they were driven to the Continent, during the Marian persecution. Such doctrines as the above, so abhorrent to all our conceptions of a pure, righteous and holy God, will help to explain the Rationalism, in all its wild extremes, which has invariably followed in the track of these “Confessions of Faith.”

* Council of Trent, Sess. IV. A. D. 1546.

press this point, for it is a vital one. Some of these new Articles of Faith are mere matters of opinion, and may or may not be true; some of them are mere matters of a modern Philosophy, and are most certainly false; some of them are most evident corruptions of the Faith, the origin of which corruptions is a matter of plain and undeniable record.

It was reserved for the present Pope, Pius IX., to make a still more startling and fatal exhibition, in the work of corrupting the Faith. On the 10th of December, 1854, the doctrine of the "IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE VIRGIN MARY" was pronounced by the Pope an Article of Faith necessary to salvation. The words of the decree are,—

"It is a dogma of the Faith, that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, from the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of God, in virtue of the merits of JESUS CHRIST, the SAVIOUR of mankind, was preserved perfectly free from all stain of original sin."

This fact formed a new era in the history of Modern Romanism. It was a bold assumption of Papal prerogative. One decrepid old man took upon himself, without the aid or authority of a General Council, to do what the whole Church Catholic has no power to do. It was a stretch of Ultramontanism which frightened sober Roman Catholics everywhere. More than this; it was making an Article of Faith necessary to salvation, out of a theory which was never taught or heard of in the Early Church, and which was generally contradicted by Rome's best and most learned Doctors, when first introduced.

Nor is this all. This new dogma was more and worse than a mere Novelty. By teaching the original and perfect sinlessness of the Virgin Mary, Rome has changed the relations which the Blessed Saviour Himself sustains to the Race, whose Nature He assumed in His Incarnation. That bond of union and of sympathy, which the Apostle describes,* is broken. The very nature of the Incarnation itself, and all the mighty truths springing from it, are lost sight of. Besides, if Rome may add one new Article of Faith, so also she may add fifty or a hun-

* Heb. ii. 14—18.

dred, and thus effectually deny any and every Article of the Catholic Creeds. Well might an able Roman Catholic writer say,—

“The opinion of the Immaculate Conception cannot be established as a dogma, and proposed as an Article of belief, without shaking the foundations of religion, by injuring the great rule of the unity and perpetuity of Faith.”*

No event in the history of modern Romanism has done so much as this to destroy all confidence in the system, and all hopes of its reformation. Henceforth Rome stands side by side with the German Infidelity, the plausible Spiritualism, the blasphemous Transcendentalism of the nineteenth century ! We know of one distinguished Romanist in this country, who was repelled by this new Romish development, and who is now sheltered in the primitive fold of our own blessed Church. There will be multitudes of such, if we are only true to ourselves and to our Great Head. Could our branch of the Church, Catholic in her Creeds, Catholic in her organization, Catholic in her Liturgy,—could she become Catholic in tone, sympathy, spirit, and action, she would soon draw thousands on thousands within her communion, from the right hand and from the left. For this great end, let us labor and pray without ceasing.

VII.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE ROMISH CHURCH DISCOUNTENANCES THE READING OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES BY THE PEOPLE.

Some modern Romish writers deny this charge. I admit, that under the pressure of public opinion, expensive editions of the Douay Version, such as it is, *and accompanied with the imposition of a Romish gloss*, are allowed to be sold. But I make the charge boldly, that that Church does discountenance the free reading of GOD'S HOLY WORD, and does prevent it wherever she can. I appeal to any and every country in the world where that Church holds undisputed sway, in proof of

* Abbe Laborde on the Immaculate Conception, p. 25.

the entire disuse, the utter neglect of the Bible among the people under Romish influence. The fact is notorious, and beyond dispute. Besides, we have the highest possible authority for the accusation. In the "Index of prohibited books," adopted by the Council of Trent, and approved by Pope Pius IV., March 24, 1564, we have the following:—

"Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that *if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it.* It is on this point referred to the judgment of the Bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest, or confessor, *permit the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, by Catholic authors, to those persons, &c., and this permission they must have in writing.*"

Why that Church dare not trust the Bible in the hands of the people, the reader can readily answer. It would be the death-blow of Popery. So the Blessed Saviour, and so the inspired writers, did not treat God's Holy Word. Jesus Christ Himself said, "*Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.*"*

The Prophet Isaiah bids Israel, "Seek ye out of the Book of the Lord, and read."†

And so far from this use of the Scriptures being "cause of more evil than good," as the Romish Church teaches, the Psalmist David, says, "The entrance of thy words giveth light, it giveth understanding *to the simple.*"‡

So also—"The Commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.§"

In the Early Church, the Bereans were commended, as being more noble than they of Thessalonica, in that "they searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things are so.¶"

St. Paul commends Timothy, because "from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus."¶¶

And unto the whole Church at Ephesus, the Apostle writes, addressing all indiscriminately, "Take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God."***

* John v. 39.

† Isaiah xxxiv. 16.

‡ Ps. cxix. 130.

§ Ps. xix. 8.

¶ Acts xxii. 11.

¶¶ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

*** Eph. vi. 17.

The Early Church, so far from hedging the Bible about with cautions and Canons, and "written permissions," on the contrary, used every possible motive to incite the early Christians to study the living oracles of God. Bingham, quoting Eusebius, and Chrysostom, and Theodoret, and St. Jerome, proves "that every nation under heaven had the Scriptures in their own tongue." He gives also—

"The plain evidence of the primitive practice, which was, the privilege and encouragement all Christians had to read the Scriptures at home, for the exercise of themselves and families in private devotion, and better preparation for the public."*

As a specimen of the Ancient Fathers, St. Chrysostom says:—

"This is the thing I have always advised, and shall still continue to exhort you to; that you should not only hear what is said in this place, but spend your time at home, continually reading the Holy Scriptures."†

And so also Origen says:—

"If the Lord Jesus find us employed in such studies, He will come and partake with us."

"The greatest torment of demons, and above all other pains they endure, is to see men reading the Word of God."

"Let us read the Scriptures of the Old Testament, let us also read the Books of the New Testament, the words of the Apostles."

"Let us come daily to the wells of the Scriptures, the waters of the Holy Spirit,—and there draw and carry home a full vessel."‡

We say, therefore, that the Romish Church, in withholding this great gift of God from those to whom He sent it, is guilty of a great moral wrong, violates the express letter and command of Holy Writ, and opposes herself to the judgment and practice of the whole Catholic Church.

VIII.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE ROMISH CHURCH DEPRIVES HER MEMBERS OF ONE HALF THE HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

* Bingham's *Ant. B.* xiii. Ch. iv., Sec. 8.

† Chrys. *Hom.* 3, in *Laz.* t. 5, p. 59.

‡ In *lib. Ies. Hom.* xx. p. 44. In *Num. Hom.* xxvii. p. 378. In *Gen. Hom.* x. p. 87. See also the testimony of the Early Church in Lardner's Works, and in the Works of Archbishop Usher.

In no part of the Romish System has that Church showed more clearly her spirit of presumption and wickedness.

Her language is,—

“If any shall say, that, by the command of God, or the necessity of salvation, all and sundry the faithful of Christ, ought to receive both kinds of the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA.”

“If any shall deny, that the whole and entire Christ, the Fountain and Author of all grace, is received under the one kind of bread, because, as some falsely assert, he is not received under both kinds, according to Christ’s institution, LET HIM BE ACCURSED.”*

Who gave that Church the right to set aside this plain command of the Lord Jesus Christ? We read,—

“Jesus took bread and blessed and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, take, eat, this is my body. And He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, DRINK YE ALL OF THIS, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins.”†

That the Apostolic Churches did, without doubt, follow the Blessed Saviour’s command, in administering the Holy Communion in both kinds, is certain. St. Paul says:—“But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, AND DRINK OF THAT CUP.”‡

St. John, also, in language which the Romanists contend referred to this Holy Sacrament, says:—“Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and DRINK HIS BLOOD, YE HAVE NO LIFE IN YOU.”§

No Romish error admits less defence than this. It is witnessed against, by the Universal Church, for more than a thousand years. It is condemned by all the Ancient Liturgies and Offices, Eastern and Western. All the Ancient Fathers, without exception, bear witness to this Holy Sacrament, as being given to all in both kinds. Not until we come down to the eleventh or twelfth Century, do we find this corruption, among others, creeping into the Latin Church. We need not quote the language of the Early Fathers. Even the Romish Cardinal Bona was forced to admit:—

* Council of Trent, Sess. XXI. Can. I. and III.

† Matt. xxvi. 26—29.

‡ 1 Cor. xi. 28.

§ John vi. 48—58.

"It is very certain that anciently, all in general, both Clergy, men and women, received the holy mysteries in both kinds, when they were present at the solemn celebration of them, and they both offered and were partakers."*

And in the same connection he adds :—

"For the faithful always, and in all places, from the very first foundation of the Church to the twelfth Century, were used to communicate under the species of bread and wine."

We say, then, that the Romish Church is guilty of most heinous sin, in daring thus to tamper with a Sacrament which Jesus Christ Himself established ; that she inflicts a grievous wrong upon her members, in withholding from them an essential part of that Sacrament ; and that no member of that Communion can say, that he has ever received the Holy Sacrament which Christ commanded.

IX.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE ROMISH CHURCH TEACHES A TRANSUBSTANTIATION OF THE BREAD AND THE WINE IN THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Lateran Council declares, that the "bread and wine, through the Divine power, are transubstantiated, the bread into the body, the wine into the blood."†

The Council of Trent confirms this error with an oath thus :—

"If any shall say that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there remains the substance of the bread and wine,—and shall deny that wonderful and remarkable conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, LET HIM BE ACCURSED."‡

I shall not here define, or attempt to define, precisely what our Blessed Lord meant, when, taking in His hands the Bread, He said, "This is my Body," and taking the Wine, He said, "This is my Blood." There was a meaning, a deep meaning in His words. To set forth that meaning, in distinc-

* Bona. Rer. Liturg. lib. 2, c. 18.

† IV Later. Coun. Can. I.—A. D. 1215.

‡ Coun. of Trent, VI. Sess. Can. I. of the Euch. A. D. 1548.

tion from the Rationalistic Zwinglianism of our popular Theology on the one hand, and from the equally Rationalistic Materialism of Rome on the other, is a needed work. Both these systems agree in this; that they equally destroy the Sacramental character of the Lord's Supper. The one, converts it into a dry and barren memorial merely; the other, makes the elements to become the very thing itself, of which they were set forth to be a Sacrament. Which of these errors is the worst, God only can tell. The one is Unbelief, the other is Superstition and Idolatry. As practical errors, both are full of mischief. It is with the error of Rome, Transubstantiation, that we are now concerned.

Rome teaches, as the word Transubstantiation signifies, that, by the act of consecration, the bread ceases to be bread, and becomes, in its substance, and literally, the Body of Christ; and that the Wine in like manner becomes, as to its substance, and literally, the Blood of Christ; and that he is to be "accursed" who denies it.

Now, that the substance of the Bread and Wine is not changed, but still remains Bread and Wine, is certain. As we have already said, the very nature of a Sacrament requires this, and this argument is, in itself, conclusive. But we have other proof. The Holy Scriptures speak of the Bread and Wine as still remaining such after the Consecration. For our Blessed Saviour *after the Supper* said,—

"I will not drink *henceforth of this fruit of the vine*, until that day when I drink it new with you, in my Father's kingdom."*

St. Paul speaks of the Consecrated Elements in similar language.

Whosoever shall *eat this bread and drink this cup unworthily*," &c.†

That the substance of the elements still remains unchanged, is further evident, from the *nature of the abuses* for which St. Paul reproves the Corinthians. "For in eating, every one taketh before other, his own supper, and one is hungry, and another is drunken."‡

* Matt. xxvi. 29.

† 1 Cor. xi. 27.

‡ 1 Cor. xi. 21.

That the substance of the Bread and Wine remains unchanged, is certain, from the evidence of our senses. Jesus Christ himself appealed to this kind of testimony, when He would prove His own personal identity, before and after His resurrection ; (Luke xxiv. 39,) and when He bid those about Him to see, how the thousands were miraculously fed, how the blind did see, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed. So, in like manner, we know that the substance of the Bread and Wine is not changed, because we have the testimony of those faculties and powers with which God has endowed us, and to whose credibility He Himself bears witness. To believe what they positively deny, as Rome bids us, would be, not above our reason, but contrary to our reason ; and this God has never required.

The Early Fathers of the Church denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation. They call the consecrated elements of this Sacrament, *figures, signs, symbols, types, antitypes, a commemoration, a representation, mysteries, and sacraments* ; when they could have been none of these, if there is a change of the substance of the elements. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory Nyssen, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Augustin, all speak of the consecrated elements *as still being Bread and Wine*, and evidently knew nothing of that pretended change of the substance of the elements, which became so fruitful in idolatrous practices in after days.

Theodoret, for example, says :—

“ Christ does honor the symbols, with the name of His body and blood, not changing the nature, but adding grace to nature.”

And again :—

“ The mystic symbols, after the sanctification, *do not depart from their own nature, for they continue in their former substance, figure and form.*”*

Ephrem of Antioch says :—

“ The body of Christ, received by the faithful, does not depart from its sensible substance.”†

* Dial. Cont. Eutych. 1 and 2.

† In Photi. Bibli. Cod. 229.

Pope Gelasius says,—(A. D. 490,)—

“The substance of the Bread and Wine does not cease to exist.”*

The early Liturgies remained longer unchanged and uncorrupted, in their primitive simplicity, but the preachers of the Gospel, in order to promote greater reverence for this Sacrament, began to use unguarded language respecting it; yet it was not till ten centuries had gone by, that the term, Transubstantiation, was adopted. Afterward, the Lateran Council incorporated it as a doctrine of the Church; and the Council of Trent, as we have seen, set its seal upon the error, by denouncing the curses of the Church upon all who presume to call it in question.†

X.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE ROMISH CHURCH CONDUCTS HER PUBLIC WORSHIP IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.

The Council of Trent declared, that,—

“Whosoever shall affirm . . . that the Mass should be celebrated in the vernacular tongue only . . . LET HIM BE ACCURSED.”‡

Such a manner of Worship is anti-Scriptural; St. Paul says,—

“Except ye utter, by the tongue, *words easy to be understood*, how shall it be known what is spoken? For ye shall speak into the air.”§

“Else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say, Amen, at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandest not what thou sayest?”||

Such a manner of Worship is anti-Primitive. In all parts of the world, where the Early Church was established, the Liturgies and Offices of the Church were always composed in the vernacular tongue. Such Liturgies of those venerable Churches still exist; as the Syriac and Greek Liturgies, Arabic and Coptic, standing monuments, in this respect, against the corruption of Modern Rome.

* Lib. de duo. Nat. Christ.

† See Bp. Cosin's History of Transubstantiation; and Bingham's Antiquities, Book xv. Ch. v. Sect. 4.

‡ XXII. Sess. Ch. 8. Can. 1.

§ 1 Cor. xiv. 9.

|| 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 17.

In the ninth Century, when the Slavons were converted to Christianity, Pope John VIII. wrote to the Prince and Bishop of the Slavons, allowing them to have the public Services in their own tongue. Such a well attested fact as this shows what was the custom of the Church at that age.

And as late as A. D. 1215, the Lateran Council ordered,—

“ Because, in most parts there are, within the same State or Diocese, people of different languages, mixed together, having, under one Faith, various rites and customs, we distinctly charge that the Bishops of these States or Dioceses provide proper persons to celebrate the divine offices, and administer the Sacraments of the Church, *according to the differences of rites and language.*”*

Such a manner of Worship is unedifying and unreasonable. An ancient writer said of the Hebrew text, “ What good doth a well sealed up ?” Well may it be asked, of what possible edification can it be to the worshippers, to address the Most High in language which is to them but unmeaning sound ? Have they no understanding to be exercised ? no conscience to be addressed ? no devout emotions of praise to be offered ? no contrition to acknowledge ? no mercy to implore ? Is such a congregation of immortal, accountable beings to be treated as so many stocks and stones ? Is the old Infidel libel, after all, true—that “ Ignorance is the mother of devotion ?” Let not the Priests of the Most High God sanction such a charge, by pretending to perform the holiest offices of devotion in language which cannot possibly express the feeling, the judgment, and the conscience of the worshippers.†

XI.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE ROMISH DOCTRINE OF INFALLIBILITY IS UNFOUNDED, UNDEFINED, AND ABSURD.

No boast of the Romish Church is more confidently made than this. Amidst the acknowledged diversity of opinion on

* IV. Lateran—Canon IX.

† The Romish Church is also inconsistent with herself. For, in her more modern efforts to bring over to the Papal Church the Greeks, the Armenians, the Nestorians, and the Maronites, she allows them still to use their own Liturgies, in their own languages, as before.

religious subjects among nominal believers, amidst prevailing doubts and uncertainties, Rome claims to speak with the greatest degree of confidence and authority. The Holy Scriptures on which that Church relies for such authority, are the following promises of Christ:—"Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."* "The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it," (the Church).†

These Scriptures do not prove infallibility of judgment at all to the Church, on all questions; they do not promise this to any particular branch of the Church; they do not promise this to the Romish Church. The most that *these* Scriptures do prove, is, the *perpetual presence* of Christ with His Church, and the *indefectibility* or *perpetual duration* of the Church. But yet, no one particular Branch or portion of the Church, has a right to appropriate even this to itself. The Church of Ephesus was threatened, that the candlestick should be removed from its place. And we know that multitudes of individual Churches, once planted on ground baptized even with the blood of martyrs, have now no name or place. The candlestick has been removed. Rome can plead no security against such a doom, without first taking for granted the very thing to be proved. We know that the Church of Christ on the Earth shall outlive all revolutions and all change, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. But we know, too, that a "falling away" first was also clearly predicted, and that that prediction has in part been fearfully fulfilled. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."‡

This claim of Romish Infallibility is *undefined*. The Romanists themselves have never been able to tell us where the seat of this infallibility is located. Nor have they ever assigned to it a personality, whose claim cannot be shown to be in the highest degree absurd and ridiculous. The Romanists known as Transalpines, contend that the Pope himself is infallible. On the other hand, the Cisalpines deny, entirely, this personal infallibility of the Pope, and contend that he may be deposed for heresy or schism. While another class of Romanists, mid-

* Matt. xxviii, 20.

† Matt. xvi. 18.

‡ 1 Cor. x. 12.

way between these, maintain, that Infallibility lies in neither the Pope alone, nor in General Councils alone, but in the decisions of Councils, after having been sanctioned by the Pope. Thus we see, that while Infallibility is a high-sounding word, on which to ring changes in the ears of discordant Sects, yet that when we come to look after the very thing itself, nobody can tell where it is.

This claim is, as we have said, *absurd*. It can be shown, again and again, that wherever this seat of Romish Infallibility may be supposed to reside, the claim is chargeable, beyond all dispute, with the most gross self-contradictions, rendering the idea of infallibility preposterous.

To quote an example or two, and for these only we have room, is the seat of Infallibility in the Pope of Rome?—In the Sixth Century, Pope Gregory said, that whoever claimed the Universal Episcopate is the forerunner of Antichrist.* And yet, a few years after, Boniface III. claimed this Universal Episcopate, and so have also numbers of his successors. *Who is infallible, Gregory or Boniface?*

In A. D. 1590, Pope Sextus V. published an Edition of the Latin Vulgate, to be received everywhere as true, legitimate, authentic, and undoubted, ordered that all future Editions should conform to it, and that *not the least syllable be changed, added, or omitted*, on pain of the greater excommunication. And yet, not long after, Pope Clement VII. *suppressed* this Edition, and published another of his own, in which he made *more than two thousand corrections*. *Who was infallible, Sextus V. or Clement VII.?*

Pope Liberius subscribed an Arian Creed, for which St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, said, "I anathematize thee, O Liberius, thee and thy companions; again I anathematize thee; and for the third time I say unto thee, O Liberius, thou art a prevaricator."†

Pope Honorius I. embraced the Monothelite heresy, for which the Sixth General Council condemned him, and he was also anathematized by several succeeding Popes. Were Hono-

* Greg. Magn. Ep. lib. vi. Ep. 30.

† Oper. pp. 1158. 1134.

rius and Liberius both infallible? Are these Popes, condemning and excommunicating each other, all infallible?

And so also, it can be shown, that wherever the seat of Infallibility is supposed to be located, that claim is preposterous. For we have before us the spectacle of Council against Council, affirming and denying the very same identical things; Council and Pope against Council and Pope, mutually contradicting each other, or contradicting the whole united voice of the Church, for hundreds of years.

Such is the Romish doctrine of Infallibility. We have shown it to be *unfounded, undefined, and absurd*. If other proofs are needed, they are abundant. The simple facts, no well-read scholar will presume to question. The difficulties in the way of this Romish theory, no honest man will either attempt to evade or answer.

XII.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE ROMISH DOCTRINE OF THE VISIBLE UNITY OF THE CHURCH IS UNSCRIPTURAL AND UNCATHOLIC.

The Romish doctrine is, that the Bishop of Rome is the divinely appointed center of Ecclesiastical Unity, and that all Christians not in communion with him, are in a state of schism. This pretension we have already examined, under our I. and II. Reasons. Besides, it can be readily shown that Romish Unity lacks reality, and is but a name; and that under this shadow of a merely nominal Unity, no other religious body has been, and is now, more thoroughly convulsed with intestine divisions. Pope against Pope,—Council against Council,—Decrees of Councils approved by some, and rejected by other portions of the Church,—every shade of doctrinal opinion vigorously attacked and defended,—rival and jealous Religious Orders, shaking Romanism to its center,—broils, wars, and commotions, carried on to advance sectional ambition;—this, and much more like this, is the real story of Romish Unity.

St. Paul thus describes the Unity of the Church:—

"There is One Body, and One Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord; One Faith; One Baptism; One God and Father of all, Who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. iv. 4—6.

The one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism, then, are the three essential marks of the Unity of the Church.

The Church must recognize "One Lord," or Head of the Church; and of necessity, also, that Ministry which He, as Lord, has appointed.

The Church must have "One Faith;" one positive unchangeable Doctrine to be believed; and that One Faith was embodied in the "Form of sound words," (2 Tim. i. 13,) before the New Testament Scriptures were written, and it has been perpetuated through the ages all along in the Apostles' and Primitive Creeds.

The Church must have "One Baptism;" which, of necessity, implies one communion and fellowship in that One Body into which her members are baptized.

All this, nothing short of this, nothing essentially beyond this, is involved in those three marks of the Unity of the Church which the Apostle has named. The Apostle did not add, "one Earthly Visible Head, the Bishop of Rome," but he does tell us that Jesus Christ "hath God given, to be Head over all things to the Church."* "Christ is the Head of the Church and Saviour of the body."† "He is the Head of the body, the Church, . . . that in all things, He might have the preëminence."‡

This Great Head of the Church, in His visible human Body, ascended to Heaven; in that same Body He now pleads, and mediates for Man; in that same Visible Body, the only Head of the Church, he will be seen to come again at the last, *even as He was seen to go.*

Awfully presumptuous, indeed, it must be for any poor mortal to attempt to occupy that place in the Church which Jesus Christ purchased for Himself, of the Father, by His own conquest of Death and Hell.

Such is the essential Unity, the Visible Unity, of the Church

* Eph. i. 22.

† Eph. v. 23.

‡ Col. i. 18.

of Christ. It is evinced and witnessed, in the visible profession of the one Lord, and one Faith,—in the reception of the one Baptism,—in the union and communion of the people with the Presbyter, of the Presbyters with the Bishop, and of the Bishops with each other, in Doctrine, Sacraments, and Councils, (for, as St. Cyprian says, “the Episcopate is one,”) and in the communion and fellowship of all, people, Presbyters and Bishops, in the common Sacraments and privileges of the Church, “in breaking of bread and in prayers,” everywhere throughout the world. *Such is the Real Unity, the Visible Unity of the Church of Christ*; a thing most unlike and abhorrent to, that forced, usurped, tyrannical, and only nominal Unity of the Church of Rome.

XIII.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE CHURCH OF ROME TEACHES A VICIOUS MORAL THEOLOGY.

Faith and Morals always go together. We have seen how the Faith has been undermined in the Romish Church. The Code of Morality taught in that Church by its most learned Doctors and Casuists, is as mischievous as it is false. Take the treatise of St. Alfonso de Liguori, as an example.* It destroys the very first principles, the fundamental basis of all true Morality. That keen thinker, Coleridge, said :—

“When I contemplate the whole system, as it affects the great fundamental principles of morality, the *terra firma* of our Humanity; when I trace its operation on the sources and conditions of national strength and well-being; and lastly, when I consider its woful influences on the innocence and sanctity of the female mind and imagination, and on the faith and happiness, the gentle fragranciness, and ever present verdure of domestic life;—I can, with difficulty, avoid applying to it what the Rabbies said of Cain, that the firm earth trembled wherever he strode, and the grass turned black beneath his feet.”

Test this matter practically. Go to any country where Rome has had undisputed sway, and see the condition of public

* See Moral Theology of the Church of Rome, by Rev. F. Meyrick, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, with an Introduction by Rev. Dr. A. C. Coxe, D. D. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson. 1856.

morals. It is the same story everywhere,—the infidelity and intense hatred of the upper-classes; the ignorance and gross superstition of the lower; and the shameless and notorious debauchery of the priesthood.* Look at Rome itself; look at Spain; look at Mexico, at Central and South America, and especially Chili and Peru. Take the testimony of men who have seen and who know what it is, where it has had full sway for centuries; for example, Dr. Achilli, the Romish Priest, Curate, Vicar, Head Professor of a College, Prior, and royal Confessor. One of our own most distinguished clergy, who, for a time, was beguiled into Popery, returned to the communion of our branch of the Catholic Church, on this very ground, that he could not remain where he was, with “a pure conscience.” What he has seen, and heard, and felt, he has never told to the world. But one of our perverts, who has come back to us, has left on record his bitter experience as a Romanist, of which the following is a specimen.† The Church has a right to know why he left us, and why he returned to us. He says:—

“Supposed infallibility led me into the communion of exclusive Rome. And no dogma taught by her would ever have made me doubt that infallibility. It is her Moral Theology, her prescribed working as a practical system, that has made the falseness of her pretension to infallibility as clear to me as any one of Euclid’s demonstrations.

Facts not to be misunderstood, facts authorized, avowed, defended, persevered in, facts of iniquity in isolated families and in combined kingdoms, opened my eyes to see, that the spiritual despotism of the Papacy is used everywhere alike recklessly, to defend and establish either the right or the wrong; to propagate either the most blessed truths, or to perpetuate the grossest errors; to require of men what is beyond the reach, and contrary to the purpose of their creation, or to make crimes black as hell pass for beautiful and holy, under color of obedience; but that it is always at war with every natural, every social, every civil relation, always breeding domestic and political anarchy, as cover for priestly domination to be hidden under.

“I know this same Church of Rome, in its petty schemes of anarchy in families, more hateful and more devilish than when it deals with nations.

* See Dr. Bexley’s description of the Romish Priests in South America. Bexley’s South and North America. New York, 1865.

† Rev. Pierce Connelly, formerly Rector of Trinity Church, Natchez, Miss.

"I have seen Priests and Bishops of the Church of Rome, their own convictions disregarded, and all responsibility to God and to society thrown off, in the instinct of hostility to man's natural relationships, (in spite, too, in one instance, of the private command of the Pope himself,) I have seen them band together, for the mere sake of a legacy or a life interest, to break down laws which are looked upon, even by savages, as the most sacred of all, divine or human. I have known a husband taught and directed to deal double in the sacred matter of religion with his own high-born wife, a brother with his own high-born sisters, wives with their husbands, and daughters without number with their trusting parents. I have known, in Derbyshire, a young lady, not eighteen years of age, the daughter of a widowed mother, the mother also a Roman Catholic, seduced into a convent under false pretences, kept there in spite of every effort of her family, with the approbation of the Papal authorities, and only delivered by my own public threat, as a Priest, of application to the civil power, and consequent fear of scandal. I have seen clerical inviolability made to mean nothing less than license and impunity. I have read to the pure and simple-minded Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, a narrative, written to a pious lay friend by a respected Roman Priest, of such enormities of lust in his fellow-Priests around him, that the reading of them took away my breath,—to be answered, 'Caro mio, I know it. I know it all, and more, and worse than all; but nothing can be done.' I have known a Priest, (here in England) practice Liguori on his clientele, simply as an amateur of wickedness, apparently without conscious malice, just as he would try poison upon dogs or cats; an Iago, without even an imaginary wrong from anybody. I have known this creature get up, and very successfully, a miracle,—(I have proofs in his own hand-writing,)—at the very moment when, as a brother Priest satisfied me, he was experimenting in seduction. But nothing could be done! I have known a Priest received and honored at a prince-Bishop's table, when the host knew him to have just seduced a member of his own family. But nothing could be done! I have been mocked with false promises, by Dean and Bishop, in denouncing a young Priest, in whose bed-room,—and before there had been time for him to dress himself,—in broad day, in England, under a convent roof, I had myself found a young nun, apparently as much at home as her confessor was himself. I have been forced to let pass, without even ecclesiastical rebuke, a Priest's attempt upon the chastity of my own wife, the mother of my children, and to find instead, only sure means taken to prevent the communication to me of any similar attempt in future.

"This is a part of what has come within my own experience. But it is not yet the worst of that sad experience.

"I have seen Priests of mean abilities, of coarse natures, and gross breeding, practice upon pure and highly gifted women of the upper ranks, married and unmarried, the teachings of their treacherous and impure casuistry, with a success that seemed more than human. I have seen these Priests impose their pretendedly divine authority, and sustain it by mock miracles, for ends that were simply dev-

ilish. I have had poured into my ears what can never be uttered, and what ought not to be believed, but was only too plainly true. And I have seen that all that is most deplorable is not an accident, but a result, an inevitable result, and a *confessedly* inevitable result of the working of the practical system of the Church of Rome, with all its stupendous machinery of mischief.

"And the system is irrevocable and irremediable."*

Not less decisive is the testimony of the Hon. Mr. Gladstone, late member of the British Parliament from Oxford. In 1851, after a brief residence at Naples, he published his personal observations of the influence of the Moral Theology of Rome on national jurisprudence. We can only give a single brief extract:—

"It is not mere imperfection, not corruption in low quarters, not occasional severity, that I am about to describe; it is incessant, systematic, deliberate, violation of the law, by the Power appointed to watch over and maintain it. It is such violation of human and written law as this, carried on for the purpose of violating every other law, unwritten and eternal, human and divine; it is the wholesale persecution of virtue, when united with intelligence, operating upon such a scale, that entire classes may with truth be said to be its object, so that the Government is in bitter and cruel, as well as utterly illegal hostility to whatever in the nation really lives and moves, and forms the mainspring of practical progress and improvement. . . . Men are arrested, not because they have committed, or are believed to have committed, any offense; but because they are persons whom it is thought convenient to confine and to get rid of, and against whom, therefore, some charge must be found or fabricated. . . . I do not scruple to assert, in continuation, that when every effort has been used to concoct a charge, if possible, out of the perversion and partial production of real evidence, this often fails: and then the resort is to perjury and to forgery."†

While there is, and will be, vice and immorality in all human society, yet such appalling facts as these are too universal, in the present case, to be a thing of accident. This is the special point to be considered. They are the natural fruit of the Romish system of Doctrine and Discipline.

XIV.

I CANNOT BE A PAPIST, BECAUSE THE CHURCH OF ROME IS HERETICAL AND SCHISMATICAL.

* Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury. Reasons for abjuring allegiance to the See of Rome. By P. Connelly, A. M. Philadelphia: 1832.

† Gladstone's Letters, pp. 7, 11, 13.

That the Romish Church is Heretical, has been already proved. She is so by the acts of individual Popes, in declaring certain Errors to be Articles of the Faith. She became Heretical, formally, when the Council of Trent publicly and officially declared certain false and pernicious Opinions to be a part of her Creed, to be received by her members on pain of damnation. True, no General Council as yet has pronounced these Opinions to be Heresy. But they are none the less heretical ; for they are mere modern Novelties, directly condemned by the WORD of GOD, by the Early Creeds, and by Catholic Tradition. Some of these new Articles of the Faith of Rome, as the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Miraculous Conception, destroy the whole scheme of Atonement and Redemption by CHRIST.

The Church of Rome is Schismatical. That learned scholar, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Whittingham, of Maryland, clearly and concisely thus states this point.

"The Romish Communion, were its doctrinal teaching pure, and its worship irreproachable, as those of the Nicene Fathers, is, in this country, contaminated with *three-fold Schism*.

(1.) It is simply Schismatic in itself—a schismatical communion set up here by schismatics who brought their Schism across the ocean, exemplifying in Church matters the old saw, 'Cælum, non animus, mutant, qui trans mare currunt.' A transatlantic navigation did not purge their Schism. It has not been repented. They never have been reconciled. Nay, when the Church, out of which they had broken, came in contact with them here, to its altars they opposed their own, and thus, in its most formal shape, renewed their Schism.

(2.) It is in communion with Schismatics, and so contaminated by their Schism. In this way, Rome itself, and every Church in its obedience, has drunk in infection from the Schism which that usurping See nursed in the British Churches ; and from the English and Irish Romanists, every Church in Christendom, now in communion with that of Rome, has, on the old established principle of Catholic Communion in the Church of Christ, derived, in a secondary degree, the guilt and disability of Schism.

(3.) Its reception of the Pseudo-œcumenical Council of Trent and its Decrees, has involved the Romish Communion, everywhere, in the highest degree of formal Schism ; of which that Council became guilty, by presuming to pretend to the establishment of new terms of Catholic Communion, in express and formal contrariety to the Decrees of the Third and Fourth General Councils, and to impose, under anathema, its pernicious innovations in Doctrine, Discipline and Worship. Every sin of which the Donatists were guilty, of presumption, bigotry, contumely, disorder, brute violence and reckless cruelty, is charge-

able against the great Schism, of which, in the Sixteenth Century, Rome made itself the head; and in an especial degree against that minor Schism in England and Ireland, with which the Romish Communion in this country is so closely inosculated as to be scarcely in any respect distinguishable.*

This,—the final objection to the Modern Church of Rome, of which I am to speak particularly,—comprises the sum and substance of nearly all the others. Claiming to be the one alone Catholic Church, hurling her silly and contemptible anathemas at the Oriental, Greek, English, American, and all other Churches, it may well be questioned how far she herself can now claim to be included at all within the Fold of the Catholic Church; loaded down, as she is, with Heresies and Corruptions; annihilating, as far as she can, the Primitive Ministry; and breathing, not love, but threatenings and wrath against all who resist her unrighteous claims.

CONCLUSION.

I have presented, as above, several of the most important of the Errors and Corruptions of the Romish Church. All that I have attempted, within such brief limits, has been; to show, first, that these are, beyond dispute, distinctly marked features of the Romish System, and then, that they constitute Reasons why no conscientious Christian can enter, or remain in, the communion of that Church. Whatever may be thought of the force of one or another of the Errors charged upon her, yet, viewed as a whole, most assuredly, the person who dares take upon himself the responsibility of such gross and manifold departures from Catholic Faith and Order and Discipline, does it at a most fearful peril.

Neither are the above all the objectionable features of Modern Romanism.

Let every one of these be obviated, and there remain almost as many more. Some, are matters of Faith, Discipline and Worship. Some, are matters of policy. For example, the present Pope, in his late Encyclical Letter, unlike the Russian Church, has dared to set himself against the Inductive Philos-

* *Am. Qr. Church Review*, Vol. V. p. 60-1.

ophy, the achievements of Modern Science, the Social progress, and the higher Civilization of the age. The abominable and gross impositions of Modern Popery, with its miserable sham miracles and grinding cruelties, cannot bear the scrutiny of an enlightened conscience ; and so the intellect must be kept in fetters. This is the whole secret of the Encyclical Letter. It was a terrible mistake. This confession of inherent weakness is already driving men from the Romish Fold ;—Men, like Arnold and Palgrave, disappointed and mortified, who had once been beguiled by her pretensions and promises. They have found her syren song to be a delusion and a lie. The peace proffered is only the silence of death ;—death to the conscience, the intellect, and the heart ; death to all true Civilization ; death to the intellectual and moral elevation of Man, in the scale of being. True Science, based on a true Philosophy, tending to social refinement and well-being, and a higher civilization, cannot contradict, nor be contradicted by, a true Faith ; but must be in harmony with it. This is a truism, which the world accepts, and will always accept. A corrupt priesthood may rave in vain ; the crushing power of this great truth will, alone, in the end, annihilate Romanism. No system of Religious Error can stand against it.

There remain, too, to be charged against Modern Rome, her Doctrine of Justification, by inherent and infused righteousness,—her disuse of Confirmation, and her multiplication of Sacraments,—her Doctrine of Purgatory and the sale of Indulgences, the source of her unholy traffic,—her Doctrine of the forced Celibacy of the Clergy, at once anti-Scriptural, and of evil tendency,—her Doctrine of Auricular Confession, and the fearful social and political evils, of which history declares it to have been the engine,—her Doctrine of the Worship of Images and Invocation of Saints,—her Doctrine of “a true, proper and Propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead, in the Mass,” when, “*once in the end of the world hath Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.*”^{*} These are some of the evils which awoke in the breast of immense numbers of her members at the Reformation, a spirit which no

^{*} Heb. ix. 26.

force could subdue. Beneath such a mountain of moral wrongs, a fire is still slumbering, which may be smothered for a while, but which cannot be extinguished, and which will finally break forth.

Would that the Church of Rome, for her own sake, for the sake of the millions of souls in her embrace, for the sake of Jesus Christ and His Church throughout the world,—would purify herself from these her corruptions. Let her, distinguishing between what is Catholic and what is Romish, return to the Faith as it was once delivered to the saints, and as it was once held "*everywhere and by all.*" She has, within herself and at her command, the elements of great efficiency. God grant that her well marshalled hosts may yet be found standing in the front ranks, at the final conflict of the Church, and the hour of her glorious victory.

There is a Branch of the Church Catholic in this country, the Protestant Episcopal Church, free from every one of the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome. She, not Rome, is truly Catholic,—Catholic, for every Truth of God; Protestant, against every error of man. Even the best writers of the Romish Church have been obliged to admit, and have admitted again and again, that her Ministry is validly ordained.* She was reformed on the basis of the Primitive Church; and by men who sealed their work with their blood. The fires of Smithfield, the sacred ashes of Cranmer, and Latimer, and Hooper, and Rogers, and Taylor, and Bradford, and Ridley, tell us how the leaders at Rome looked upon their labors. That Reformed Church stands forth, to-day, among us, firm as the Rock on which she is planted, Primitive, Catholic and Apostolic, in her Faith, Ministry and Worship; equally removed from the disintegrating tendency of Sectism and the grinding Despotism of Rome. Elevating and ennobling in all her influences, she is regarded more and more as that great Spiritual Element which the New World needs; and as the only hope of our country for rescuing its countless millions from the embraces of Error, and for building up the pure Religion of

* See *Palmer on the Church*, Vol. II. Ch. x.

the Cross of Christ. May God verify His promise, that, as her day is, so her strength shall be. May she be true to herself, and to her great Head.

Thus, my dear Doctor, I have given, in the briefest space possible, a statement of the most prominent Errors and Corruptions of the Modern Church of Rome.* That she is really responsible for every one of them, I think has been proved. That they are a fatal bar to all union and communion with her, until she shall be thoroughly reformed, is beyond dispute. If what has been written shall meet the eye of any inquiring member of the Church of Rome, to such an one let me say :—Do not dream that that Church, at the present day, represents or is in harmony with the true Primitive, Catholic and Apostolic Church which JESUS CHRIST established. We put the question fairly and frankly ;—Can you, dare you, remain in connection with a System, charged with the Errors and Corruptions for which she is, beyond doubt, responsible? On such a subject, be honest with yourself. Unterrified by Rome's now harmless threats, search, in the light of God's Word, as interpreted by the very men who wrote it, for the Old Paths, for the Old Faith "once delivered to the saints," for the Old Church. If these pages shall serve to relieve the doubting, and confirm the wavering ;—if they shall show to any inquirer the immovable foundations and the imperative claims of that One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which has been established in this country,—my whole object in writing will have been attained.

With great respect, I am your affectionate Brother in Christ and the Church,

N. S. RICHARDSON.

ART. IV.—THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE THIRTY-NINE.

Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

HOLY Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

OF THE NAMES AND NUMBER OF THE CANONICAL BOOKS.

Genesis,
Exodus,
Leviticus,
Numbers,
Deuteronomy,
Joshua,
Judges,
Ruth.
The First Book of Samuel,
The Second Book of Samuel,
The First Book of Kings,
The Second Book of Kings,

The First Book of Chronicles,
The Second Book of Chronicles,
The First Book of Esdras,
The Second Book of Esdras,
The Book of Esther,
The Book of Job,
The Psalms,
The Proverbs,
Ecclesiastes or Preacher,
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon,
Four Prophets the greater,
Twelve Prophets the less.

And the other Books (as *Hierome* saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine; such are these following:

The Third Book of Esdras.
The Fourth Book of Esdras,
The Book of Tobias,
The Book of Judith,
The rest of the Book of Esther,
The Book of Wisdom,
Jesus the Son of Sirach,

Baruch the Prophet,
The Song of the Three Children,
The Story of Susanna,
Of Bel and the Dragon,
The Prayer of Manasses,
The First Book of Maccabees,
The Second Book of Maccabees.

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical

As the object of this Paper will be, to give an historical sketch of the views of the English Reformers, and of our own Church, respecting the Canon of Scripture, it will be important for us to quote the first Article of the English Church, relative to this Canon, and which was published during the reign of Edward VI. It is as follows:—

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby, although it may be sometimes received of the Faithful, as godly and profitable for an order and comeliness, yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it, as an Article of Faith, or reputed requisite to the necessity of salvation.”

This Article resembles, it will be perceived, the first paragraph of our present Sixth Article ; but it leaves out, entirely, lists of canonical books. In it the earlier English Reformers seem to have taken for granted, what the Scriptures *are*, as though it were not necessary, in *their* day, to be particular in defining what books should be embraced under the specific term of Holy Writ. The stress of their Article lay rather upon the use and application of Scripture, as to the extent and boundaries of doctrine.

But before the Articles were reviewed, in 1562, it became a point of very serious deliberation, *what* books are to be considered sources of such doctrine, and what are *not* to be considered such. The Council of Trent, at its fourth Session, in 1546, had issued a decree, which required the faithful to esteem as Scripture, not only the books of the Old Testament, which are generally acknowledged by Christendom, but many which a large portion of Christendom rejected. So the very constituent elements of Scripture came to be matters of controversy, as well as the legitimate bearings of Scripture ; and the method of determining its signification, when constructions are difficult, doubtful, or opposite. Probably, in 1552, there had been no great solicitude awakened about the constituency of Holy Scripture ; for the Puritans had not then begun to raise those objections, and make those troubles about the distinction between canonical and apocryphal writings, which they afterwards did, and the Church of our Reformers was not as much disturbed by the Trentine list of canonical books, as might have been expected. We take this view of the matter, because our readers may be surprised to learn, how favorably such a Reformer as old Miles Coverdale, (who in some respects was so pragmatical,) how very favorably he received the Apocrypha. His title to the Apocrypha, in his translation of the Scriptures, is as follows :—"The books and treatises which, among the Fathers of old, are not reckoned to be of like authority with the other books of *the Bible* ; neither are they found in the Canon of the Hebrew." It will be seen, that in a free sense, he does not hesitate to call them a part of the Bible. And he pursues this use of language ; for, in his

Address to the Reader, which follows the title just given, he styles the books of the Apocrypha, books of Scripture, or of the Bible, no less than *five times over*; and thus testifies to their value and reputation. "I have not gathered them together, to the intent I would have them despised or little set by; or that I should think them false, for I am not able to prove it." This will answer pretty well for a Puritan, whose shoulders became so uneasy under a Bishop's robes, that you might have suspected him of wearing Hercules' shirt of fire. We shall not, therefore, think it necessary to be more particular, than to say in general terms, that the free sense in which Coverdale calls the Apocrypha Scripture, is a practice in which he was imitated by his fellow-Reformers. For example, we find traces of it in the works of Bishop Jewell, and in the Homilies of our Church.*

But in 1562, there were some puffs of those breezes beginning to blow, which became at length as furious as the blasts of Æolus against the Trojan fleet. The reviewers of the Prayer-Book scented the coming gale, and so prepared their Church for it, by defining her position upon the great questions,—What *is* Scripture? and, What *is not* Scripture? and, How are we to view those Books, which the Church of Rome has endorsed, and which some of the ancient Councils, after the pattern of the Jews themselves, have rejected?

We say the pattern of the Jews; for we presume it is hardly necessary to remind our readers, that in respect to the New Testament, *all* Christendom is substantially agreed; as we would to God it were in respect to many other things: no difference of any moment having prevailed in it, in reference to the Canon of the Christian Scriptures.† The only controversy, of any serious extent, respects the Old Testament; and this, confessedly, is a subject of far lower consequence, and one where the traditions of the Jewish Church are deserving of reverential deference. We say *serious*, alluding to the very

* Jewel in Stand. Wks. P. E. Ch. III., p. 262. Instances out of the Homilies, in No. XC. Oxf. Tracts. Bingham's Antiq., 8vo. ed., IX., 93.

† Bergier, in his Diet. I., 133, says, the Calvinists have denied the Books of James, Jude, and the Apocalypse.

serious and anathematizing earnestness with which the Church of Rome insists upon our acceptance of the Apocrypha; though why she should do so, we are at a loss to conjecture. A Church, which can pronounce a decree of a Pope equal to any authority under Heaven, can hardly want a Bible of any sort; and still less, a Bible made up of books, whose pretensions are contradicted.

Still, with wise forecast concerning coming events, the Reviewers of 1562 endeavored to prepare their Church for conflicts respecting the Canon of Scripture, by saying what it is believed the Primitive Church would now say, if it could utter a living voice, *viz.*, that we may divide the books which claim to be Scripture, into *two classes*, those of whose canonicity there "was never any doubt in the Church," and those which are esteemed apocryphal or doubtful,—*i. e.*, apocryphal or doubtful, not as having no claim to so high an honor, but as having claims which may be questioned, and which, accordingly, are sufficient to destroy the *doctrinal* authority of any book, in a predicament so equivocal.* Wherefore, at this juncture, our Article was made to go on, and to say not only how Scripture was to be esteemed and treated, but also what was Scripture, in all its genuineness, and also what was Scripture in a lower sense,—a sense sufficient to save it from abandonment and rejection, but which would deprive it of all pretensions as a basis for doctrine.

The tenor of the Sixth Article, as it now stands, is doubtless familiar to Episcopalians, and also the fact, that it conflicts with Romish dogmatism on the one hand, and Puritanical prejudice on the other. It can now be seen, how it behooves us to sketch, by the light of history, the correctness of the ground our Church has taken;—in other words, to show that our doctrinal Canon of Scripture is the one which the Primitive Church adopted; and, moreover, that the Primitive Church never scorned and flouted the Apocrypha, as it has been the fashion of modern ages to do.

* Some good people treat the Apocrypha, as Bp. Butler says infidels treat Revelation, as if a doubt implied *no* evidence. Whereas, he most correctly maintains, that a doubt implies evidence.—Anal. Pt. 2, ch. 6. Or, Vol. I., p. 228, of his Works.

In commencing an inquiry respecting the constitution of the Canon of Scripture, as held by the Primitive Church, we should here remember, that our contest is not with Infidels, who would not believe in any Canon at all. If it were, we might appeal to such an allusion as is found in the Nicene Creed, to show that Scriptures of some sort were common and notorious things, in the age when the Nicene Creed was promulgated. We allude to the expression, "And the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures." Such an incidental and unstudied allusion, on the part of the Nicene Fathers, proves, incontestably, that Scriptures,—whatever those Scriptures might be,—were familiarly acknowledged and appealed to in their early times.*

But our object is not to make an offset against the Infidel, but against those who acknowledge Sacred Scriptures, as well as we do, yet not the same Canon of them. Our Sixth Article, *e. g.*, lays down the following list, as composing the Canon of the Old Testament; *Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, etc.* But the Romish Canon is quite different, and adds the following books to our list, (which, by the way, is the same with that acknowledged by the Jews,) viz., the Book of Tobit, that of Judith, of Wisdom, of Ecclesiasticus, of Baruch, and those of the Maccabees, which are usually bound up with English Bibles,—there being *five* books of the Maccabees, altogether. While the Puritanical Canon, if there be such a thing, would probably pare down the list, which we derive from the Jews, by leaving out such a book as that of Job, or the Canticles of Solomon.†

It may seem singular, and we confess it is, *prima facie*, a singular fact, that the Church Catholic did not, (unless some records of Councils are lost,) agree upon a list of canonical books, at the earliest date, and never directly in a General

* Lists, according to Tertullian, may have been prepared. Kaye's Tertullian, p. 296, 3d edit. And these lists may be lost. Wordsworth on the Canon, p. 135, 2d edit., English.

† The Anabaptists rejected Job; Castalio the Canticles. Rogers on the 39 Art., p. 81, Parker edit. Dr. J. Pye Smith rejected the Canticles. Many Baptists, it is said, now reject, as an authority, the whole of the Old Testament.

Council. It may seem the more so, because attacks upon the Canon of Scripture were not a new thing in Church History, when at length we do meet with a canonical table, drawn up by an ecclesiastical synod. For example. The Jews were accustomed to impeachments of the Canon of Scripture, as well as ourselves. The Sadducees, it is said, received but the five books of Moses; which is the reason, probably, why our Saviour proved to them the Resurrection of the dead out of those books. The Samaritans received the Law, and many of them (we are inclined to think) the Prophets;* abandoning, of course, the last of the three volumes into which the Jews divided their Testament, *i. e.*, the Hagiography, or, as it is called in the Gospel of St. Luke, the Psalms,—the Psalms being the first or oldest book in the collection, of which the volume was made up.†

Now, although the fiercest controversies raged respecting the *interpretation* of the Scriptures, in the early ages of Christianity, and although heretics of different descriptions denied the authority of one or another portion of the present New Testament, yet no Council, no collective ecclesiastical authority whatever, seems to have bestirred itself in determining the *Canon* of Scripture, against the objections of carping doubters and misbelievers, until the Council of Laodicea, which sat, say, A. D. 365.‡ It is true, that the Canons of Laodicea were affirmed by the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon; and may therefore be considered as the voice of the Church Catholic. But this was not until A. D. 451. And besides the list drawn up by this Council, we have no list arranged by any Council of consequence, save one, of Carthage, in A. D. 397, until we

*The Samaritans are unfairly treated. Our Saviour fared better in Samaria than in Jerusalem. His parable of the good Samaritan, and the story of the ten lepers, show us *His* estimation of them. The Gospel had great success in Samaria; (Acts viii., 5, 6,) and the first recorded Confirmation took place there. (Acts viii., 14—17.)

†Luke xxiv., 44. This is the only place in the New Testament, where all the volumes of the Jewish Bible are mentioned *together*.

‡It is put 365, though the dating varies, that it may be easily remembered. Let a reader associate it with the number of days in a year, and he will never forget it.

reach the act of the fourth session of the Council of Trent, which established the Canon of the Roman Church, as it is now accepted and prevalent among Papists.

The sum and substance then of the conciliar history of the Canon of Scripture, is embraced in the acts of these three Councils. And our object will now be to show what Canons these several Councils promulgated, and to inform our readers, by the light of history, of their respective authority. When the History of the Canon, in connection with Councils, has been sketched, we can—if it be desirable—pass on to the history of it, in the view of individuals.

Perhaps it may not be amiss to meet here a question, which will sooner or later force itself upon our attention, *viz.* : Why did not the Church, at an earlier period, take up the all-important subject of the Canon ? and why did but two Councils formally discuss and determine its component parts ?

We have already alluded to the fact, that heretics attacked the Canon of Scripture in primitive times, and many might suppose it would be as natural and proper for Councils to direct their attention to corruptions of *that*, as to corruptions of doctrine. But here is a fact to be remembered, of the most important bearing. The heretics who assailed the Canon of Scripture, in the earlier ages of Christianity, were not heretics of much consequence ; unless perhaps as seedlings, which, by and by, grew up into formidable thorns and briars. The heretics of higher pretensions and more dangerous tendencies, were as much agreed as the orthodox, about the Canon of Scripture. "We must add," says an authority, "that heretics quoted and admitted the same Scriptures, with the exception of those outrageous heretics, such as the Gnostics and the Manichees, who were rather heathen philosophers with a tinge of Christianity, than Christians with a defilement of philosophy. Thus the Montanists, the Donatists, Arius, Photinus, Lucifer, and other schismatics and heretics, of the first four centuries, received the same sacred books with the Catholic Christians."* This made it far less necessary to vindicate and

* Browne on the 39 Art., pp. 177, 178. Bp. Wms'. edit. No mean proof this of the strength of the testimony on which the Canon stood. It could only be pecked at by the insignificant.

fix the Canon by authority, than we, reasoning *a priori*, presume was necessary. It showed that it was comparatively easy to determine that Canon, by the evidence of tradition, in a way which carried conviction to the minds of men of the most clashing and contradictory opinions.

It can now be seen, why the Canon of Scripture was comparatively unattended to, in the earlier ages. And the very first conciliar action of the Church, in relation to the Canon, will confirm the view now taken, that *all* Christians, in primitive times assented, with wonderful unanimity, to the Canon of Scripture, because that action was not so much a vindication of the Canon, as a direction for *its use* in public worship. This was the sixtieth or last Canon of the Council of Laodicea, which prescribed,—

“That no books which had been composed only by private persons, should be read in the Church, nor any other which were not canonical, but only those which belonged to the Canon of the Old and New Testament.”*

It is remarkable, by the way, that this Council is the one which our brethren on the left say, *first* speaks of forms of prayer. But it did not *create* forms of prayer; it merely regulated *their use*, just as it did that of the Canon of Scripture. The eighteenth Canon of Laodicea ordained, that the same prayers should be repeated at nones and vespers. Self-willed and self-sufficient people had got into the way of reading other books than Scriptural ones in the Church; and so, *pari passu*, they had fallen into the habit of using other prayers than those which had been prescribed. The Council regulated these disorderly practices; and it could no more be said that the Council created forms of prayer, than that it created Scripture.

The Council of Laodicea, then, did not attempt to protect the Canon of Scripture against heretics or misbelievers, but merely against disorderly private-judgment Christians, who thought their wild notions quite as worthy mention in the house of God, as the Word of God Himself;†—a peculiarity not uncommon in our day, as well as in that of the Laodicean

* Bp. Cosin's Wks., iii., 68. New edit., Oxford.

† Hooker's View, Ecc. Pol., Book V., ch. 20.

Synod ; and, strange as it may seem, not uncommon in the days of the Puritans, too, since they once refused flatly to read the Bible in public Worship, because the naked text had no virtue in it, and must be accompanied by *their* gloss, to give it life and converting energy.*

Of course we now have, what many writers on Church History by no means attempt to give us, the philosophy of the action of the Laodicean Synod, in bringing up, *formally*, the books of Scripture for careful review ; and if we will keep it steadily in mind, we shall find ourselves relieved from one of the greatest difficulties, in relation to its lists, which have been encountered by commentators. The Revelation of St. John is not mentioned in those lists ; and the difficulty has seemed to some dark, if not insuperable. But let it be carefully recollected, that these lists were not prepared for a text-book in dogmatic theology, but for what may be called a Church calendar. The Revelation of St. John was left out of the calendar of the Laodicean fathers, just as it is all but left out of ours ; not because they did not believe in it, but because it was, and yet is, esteemed a book so mysterious and recondite, as to be appropriate for the student's closet, rather than for perusal in a Service intended for devotional purposes alone. We confess, frankly, that when we first saw the Revelation excluded from the Laodicean lists, our heart trembled with apprehension ; since, (knowing that we and all Christians *now* received it,) we feared we might have to impeach or disparage the testimony of the Fathers of Laodicea, and of many Fathers more. Nearer examination into the object they had in view,—the scope and aim of their sixtieth Canon,—satisfied us, they were worthy all credit, and that their seeming slight of the Apocalypse did not impair its genuine weight.

And now, in respect to the Council of Carthage, which sat in 397, it will be found that the object and aim of *that* Council renders it virtually a parallel to the Council of Laodicea. The forty-seventh Canon of this Council, (to which Romanists are so fond of appealing, as sustaining their notions of the Canon of Scripture,) is the one which mentions the Canonical

* Coit's Puritanism, p. 221.

Scriptures, by name, and in order. And the list, to which the Council refers, is, undoubtedly, a nearer parallel, *verbally*, to the Romish list, than ours. It includes the Apocryphal books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and, in some Latin copies, two books of the Maccabees.*

But there are some explanatory facts, in relation to this Canon, which materially affect its authority, as employed by members of the Latin Church or Church of Italy.

a.—It is the act of a Provincial Council; was passed with a distinct consciousness of the fact, that it needed the sanction of the Church at large, or it would be valueless;† and was never affirmed by any Council Ecumenical, unless the Quinisext be one; while the Latinists or Papists, never acknowledge *that*, except in a piece-meal sort of a way, cutting and carving with the most unbounded liberty of private judgment. And it may be well enough to say, *obiter*, that this is the way in which they treat all Councils, *i. e.*, with the most lawless eclecticism. Only let us have the privilege of treating Latin or Italian Christianity itself, as that treats the Councils of the Church, and we can make Romanism the very perfection of all religion, and all we wish or want. Romanism, as our English Reformers ever contended, need not be frittered away into stark annihilation. All the discipline it requires is, its own eclecticism, governed by judicious rules, *i. e.*, not the eclecticism of self-will, but that founded upon principle, and regulated by primitive precedent.

b.—The act of the Council of Carthage, like the act of the Council of Laodicea, already reviewed, was not an act defensive of the Canon of Scripture, against heretics and unbelievers, but merely an act of discipline within the Church, for the regulation of the Church's own worshippers. At Carthage, as at Laodicea, the habit had crept in, of reading things not esteemed Scripture in any sense. Just as the Latin Church now reads legends of the saints, and similar trash, so the Church of Carthage had fallen into a loose way, and allowed stuff

* Percival on the Roman Schism, p. 428.

† Du Pin on the Canon. A most elaborate and learned work, though but little known. Bk. I., ch. 1, § 6.

which was not edifying, to be introduced amid the solemnities of public worship. Some corrective had to be applied ; and the corrective attempted was, to confine such readings to the contents of Scripture only. Here, however, it is particularly to be noted, that the word *Scripture* was sometimes used in a looser sense, in primitive times, than it is now used in dogmatic theology ; precisely as it can be found used by Bishops Coverdale and Jewel, and in the Homilies of our Church. In this sense, Scripture embraces *all* the books which have any tangible claim to the title. In our Sixth Article, which is dogmatic and precise, we see *how, i. e.*, in what specific sense, our Church calls the Apocrypha Scripture. She calls it so, merely “for example of life and instruction of manners,” and not “to establish any doctrine” whatever. And the free use of the word Scripture, as Bishop Cosin assures us, prevailed among the ancient authors of the Church, *viz.*, of calling many things divine, and also Holy Scripture, not as inspired or canonical for purposes of doctrine, but as contradistinguished from profane and secular writings. To such an extent was this usage carried, that sentences out of the Fathers, decrees of Councils, and Epistles of the Popes, when compared with the writings of heathen philosophers or moralists, were styled Scriptures.* Indeed, we may say we have the same usage among ourselves, when we call histories of the Church *sacred* histories, and the hymns of the Church *sacred* poetry. Dr. Watts went so far as to call his songs for children *divine* ; but who ever dreamed that the good man fancied himself inspired ?

Now the same difference, very likely, existed between the Canon of Laodicea and the Canon of Carthage, that now exists among ourselves, in our appellations for sacred writings, that can be traced to high antiquity. The Laodicean Fathers employed the phrase *Canonical Scripture*, in the stricter sense of the term, indeed, in the strictest sense of the term ; for they not only left out the Apocrypha, but the Revelation of John also ; because to *that* they did not allow common Christians to appeal, even for doctrine ;—it being considered so far

* Cozin's Wks. III., 119—123.

above them as to be fit for the understandings of adepts in divine knowledge, for Doctors, Bishops, and the wranglers of the schools. The Carthaginian Fathers employed the phrase, *Canonical Scripture*, in a looser and more popular way. They made, no doubt, the same distinction which the illustrious Doctor, St. Augustine, makes, or at least appears to make, between the Canon of Scripture, and the *whole* or *entire* Canon of Scripture,—meaning by the first, probably, what may be applied to doctrinal matters, or relied on for theological purposes alone; and by the latter, what may be used for devotional and moral purposes.*

And if we will keep this distinction clearly in view, there is no difficulty, none whatever, in saying, the Primitive Church was perfectly at one, upon the grand subject of the Scriptural Canon; that the prescriptions of Laodicea, and of Carthage, do not materially differ; and that therefore the testimony of the Church of old, as to this Canon, may be taken, *all* of it, without hesitation, and as a unit. Our own Church could hardly have followed in the path of the two Councils, which are the only primitive Councils of any consequence to be appealed to upon this subject, more exactly and appositely than she has done. With Laodicea, she defers to what may be called the *close* Canon, only for doctrine. With Carthage, she refers to what may be called the *broad* Canon, for the purposes of moral example, and the promotion of devotional feeling; since it cannot be denied, that, aside from its claims to be considered Scripture, the Apocrypha has in it a fund of moral precept, often expressed with uncommon vigor, and all the felicitous beauties of oriental rhythm and rhetoric.

Rome and the Italian Church were not content with such judicious and discriminating use of primitive models. Rome and its abettors wanted the Apocrypha, to eke out one of their favorite dogmas, Purgatory, by seeking a sanction for prayers in behalf of the departed. They thought this was to be found in one of the books of the Maccabees; and so the Apocrypha

* It is not unlikely the Council might follow St. Augustine, if he were present at the Council. And the Romish doctors say he was. (Cozin's Wks. III., 143.) He became a Bishop in A. D. 395.

became precious in their eyes.* And since it would not answer to cull books of Scripture, known and read of all men, as it would Canons out of musty records of Councils, which not one in a thousand would ever get sight of, the Apocrypha had to be accepted or rejected, as a whole. Hence, it was so endorsed and accepted. And in the Fourth Session of Rome's pet Council, (that of Trent,) we find the list of the Council of Carthage erected, not as the Council itself erected it, into a list of books which might be read in Divine Service, but into a standard for doctrine; and, moreover, so endorsed and accepted, when the list of the Council was doubtful and disputed; for, as some contend, the Council did not include in its list, either the Book of Baruch, or the Books of the Maccabees.† But the Maccabees were especially wanted, for the purpose before mentioned; and therefore they were gulped down, without a pause to examine their pretensions with nicety. They might have been lost, if put into the alembic of searching investigation; and Rome took them, as she takes anything she likes, upon half evidence, or no evidence, while what she does not like, she will not accept, if testified to by every book of the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, or all the Fathers, from Ignatius to St. Bernard. Strange indeed is it, that such a private-judgment Church should so hate Protestantism! But it may be, upon the old principle, that two of a trade can never agree. Protestantism invaded Rome's monopoly of the right of private judgment; and the trespass has never been forgiven, nor will it ever be.

Having now furnished our readers, as briefly as may be, a summary of the history of the Canon of Scripture, so far as it is testified to by the acts of important Councils, it may now seem in order to go over the same subject, as exhibited in the writings of the Fathers, to ascertain how they accord with the public acts of the Church. But we hardly conceive this neces-

*See II. Macc. xii., 39—45. Rather a vexatious case for Latinists to quote, however. By verse 40th, it will be perceived that all these people prayed for, died in mortal and damning sin. An 'ebrew Jew might possibly pray for such wretches, but never a consistent Papist!

† Perceval on the Roman Schism, p. 428.

sary, unless it may be in relation to the testimony of St Augustine, whom the Papists are not over fond of hearing mentioned, when you talk of Jansenism, and quote him as a high authority about predestination and special grace ; but to whom, (upon the principle of picking and choosing, to which we have just made reference,) they are exceedingly fond of appealing, when you talk of the Canon of Scripture. They yearningly fancy, that *his* Canon, the Canon of Carthage, and the Canon of Trent, are identically the same.

So we will comment, presently, on St. Augustin's Canon. Meanwhile, as our own Church herself, in her Sixth Article, appeals to one of the most celebrated of the Fathers, the contemporary too of St. Augustine, it is quite evident that she knew how to make such an appeal, and how too to make it pertinently. She mentions St. Jerome as her ancient authority, in reference to the character of the Apocrypha, and the use to be made of its different books. And, for such a purpose, St. Jerome would be a far higher standard of reference than St. Augustine. For, while St. Augustine is called, in our Homily, on the peril of Idolatry, "the best learned of all ancient doctors," *i. e.*, of theologians ; and while his pretensions as a theological reasoner and a controversialist are not surpassed by any one of the Fathers, it is notorious, that as a critic upon Scripture, and the history and merits of the books composing Scripture, St. Jerome altogether outrivalled him. Augustine was not a scholar in Oriental tongues at all, and was hardly able to read Greek. While Jerome was profoundly skilled in those tongues, and in the lore which they contained. Augustine could never have accomplished such a work as Jerome did, when he translated the Bible, wrote prefaces to the various books, and annotations upon their text. Jerome, therefore, as *the* Biblical critic of his day, and one of the first Biblical critics among all the Fathers, was the rather to be applied to, for testimony, to settle any point respecting the integrity of Scripture, and the specific adaptation of the books which compose the Canon.*

Still, with all this in view, Augustine's list will not avail the

* St. Jerome never altered his opinion about the Apocrypha, to the day of his death. Cozin's Wks. III., 112.

Papists, even if we accord it to them as it is ; provided they will receive it with *his own* limitations and qualifications. Of these he makes no less than *five*, which we will give in the language of Bishop Cosin :—

“ *First*.—He putteth a note of difference between those books, which have the general name of Divine Scripture, and those which are specially called canonical. *Second*.—Then he setteth a mark on those, that, for their undoubted verity, are more securely read than others. *Third*.—Next, he distinguisheth the total canon or number of the books, into two several kinds, of which some were received by *all* churches, and some by but a few ; and preferreth those that were acknowledged either by all, or the most eminent and apostolical churches, before those that certain particular churches, and of less authority, accepted. *Fourth*.—Moreover, he admitteth a subdivision, even of this latter kind, whereof some might be received by the greater, and some by the better sort of men ; which, notwithstanding, (because that had seldom happened, and was not usually noted,) he thought to be of equal authority. *Fifth*.—And, lastly, he premiseth this caution, before the recital of his General Canon, that all these considerations may not be neglected by him that readeth it.”*

Upon these limitations and qualifications, however, Popery will exercise that most pernicious attribute of itself and of extreme Protestantism, *viz.*, unlimited private judgment ; so that Bishop Cosin might well rebuke its willfulness, and arrogance, and inconsistency, in these stinging and truthful words :

“ If the Council of Trent, whereby the Romish Church is now governed, had set such a preface before *their* Canon of Scriptures, as this is that St. Augustine set before *his*, and had added no more to the end, than he did, they might have had the fairer plea for themselves. But so far are they from allowing their Canon to be received, with any such qualifications and distinctions, as these be, that *first* they command all the books recited in it, (among which are all those that all Churches at least received not, and none at all in *their* sense,) to be equally accepted and taken with the self-same veneration, as having all an absolute and Divine authority annexed to them ; and *then* they damn all the Churches in the world besides, that will not thus receive that Canon upon their own terms ; which neither St. Augustine, nor any other Father before or after him, ever did.”†

* Cosin's Wks. III., 132, 133, for both quotations. Dr. Henderson on Inspiration, says, St. Augustine retracted his opinion in favor of the Apocrypha. Henderson, (1836,) pp. 494-5.

† *Ut Supra*.

This shows, glaringly, what St. Augustine's testimony, under Romish manipulation, amounts to ; and that when fairly treated and comprehended,—as he himself would have wished it treated and comprehended,—it makes altogether for our view of the matter. Indeed,—for it is quite unnecessary to run over a catalogue of the Fathers, and present the testimony of Melito, Origen, &c., &c., down to Gregory the Great, which one can easily find in any modern work,—if we can be allowed to make but that distinction, which the Ancients made, between the Canon of Scripture, in a *common and large sense*, and the same Canon in a *strict and univocal sense*, the whole subject lies in a nutshell.

In a common and large sense, the Romish Canon may easily be accepted ; and we do accept it, when we say, that its various books may be read in Church, “for example of life and instruction of manners.” In this sense, we even extend the Canon beyond the bounds of Romish orthodoxy ; since we allow the books of Esdras, and the Prayer of Manasses, to stand in the Apocrypha by the side of books which Rome dignifies as fully canonical Scripture. We do not actually read them in our churches ; but an order to that effect in the Prayer Book, a change in the Table of Lessons, would render them just as readable in Church as the books of Wisdom or Ecclesiasticus ;—which are the only ones permitted to be read in these United States. The Church of England allows some other books ; but not the book of Esdras, or the prayer of Manasses.

In a strict and univocal sense, the Romish Canon cannot be sanctioned ; for we may not appeal to any books for proof of doctrine, whose canonical character is not clearly established.

This is the rule we go by ; and our readers have seen how the Church in primitive times bears us out. It may not be unimportant to add, that the Greek Church, *the oldest of all Churches*, takes cur stand upon this subject ; and that the earlier and better non-Episcopal Protestants did the same.*

With such testimony in behalf of the stand assumed by our Church, from antiquity, from the Oriental Church, and from

* Blackmore's Russ. Catechism, p. 38,—Belgic Confession in Hall's Harmony of Confessions, p. 11,—French Divines. Bingham's Ant. IX., 95.

Protestantism in its purer and better developments, Episcopalians will not hesitate to accept the Sixth Article of the Thirty Nine, as historically the belief of the Church of Christ, respecting the Canon of Scripture, from remotest times, and among all its better, and purer, and genuinely catholic portions. As to what may be called the Doctrinal Canon, they will have, perhaps, hardly so much as one serious qualm ; and if they are at all fastidious respecting the Apocrypha, just let them refer to the Table of Lessons for Holy Days, and they will discover more latent Protestantism in its arrangements, than many are apt to suspect. Thus, those days which are set apart as at all commemorative of the Virgin Mary, of St. Peter, or St. Paul, are sure to have apocryphal lessons prescribed for them ; while on St. Andrew's day, and even on St. Thomas's, we read nothing but entirely canonical Scripture. A singular fact this, if our Church were at all disposed to unduly exalt the Virgin, or "chiefest Apostles," after the fashion of Anti-Catholics, in their worship of saints and ecclesiastical heroes. Now, it was with the deeply Protestant design of preventing the Virgin's days, with St. Peter's and St. Paul's days, from being over-honored, that portions of inferior or doubtful Scripture were assigned to them, to let it be seen and felt, that how much soever they might be honored, as instances of God's grace and benedictions, they were still but mortals, and as such, worthy our veneration only, and not our spiritual homage.* We once mentioned this design of the Apocryphal Lessons, to a clerical brother, as we were on our way to Public Worship, on a Saint's Day, and when an impracticable Bishop would not excuse him from the task of reading them. He was eminently Protestant and "evangelical," and was going to service with a somewhat heavy brow. Our explanation cleared his downcast eye, and he walked onward with a free step and a disburdened heart. We will only subjoin, in closing, that *he* found true, what hundreds of others have done, that when the usages of our Church are patiently inquired into, they will be found always, or almost always, to bring out the same results, to any but a one-sided mind, which will have no stand-point but its

*Shepherd on the Com. Prayer, I., 177, 178.

own for discursive observation. No wonder is it, that such a mind is perpetually fault-finding. It is like a man dwelling in a cave, with a single crevice, and who can never enjoy light, except when it comes in one direction. Our Church was not designed for such men, but for those who will judge her by the well-weighed testimonies of long and impartial history. She will be found to be a reasonable mother, to those who will ask modestly and filially for the philosophy of her counsels. If we condemn her, *a priori*, it is not surprising that she should, sometimes, appear stiff and unaccommodating. Let us do unto her, as we would she should do unto us ; and we shall assuredly understand her better, better appreciate her gentle and amiable temper, and love and obey her with increasing willingness and zeal.

ART. V.—JONES'S CRITIQUE ON THE HAMILTONIAN PHILOSOPHY.

Know the Truth. A Critique on the Hamiltonian theory of Limitation, Including some Strictures upon the Theories of Rev. Henry L. Mansel, and Mr. Herbert Spencer ; by JESSE H. JONES. New York : Hurd & Houghton. 1865.

THIS is, evidently, Mr. Jones's first venture in the region of metaphysical thought. There is much to commend ; but there is also much that will lead him to regret, in after years, that he had not read and studied more before going into print. We doubt whether any thinker or writer has ever presumed to speak with so much assurance, upon themes of so much depth and gravity, with so little preparation. In view of the nature of the subjects handled, and the vast amount of labor bestowed upon them, by many of the best trained and furnished intellects of the race,—in view, moreover, of the large space they have occupied in the history of controversial thought,—we are constrained to say that, in our judgment, this author has sinned against modesty and good taste, in coming before the public as a party to the profoundest issue in metaphysical science, while manifestly ignorant of the illustrious record of thought and learning in the department of mental activity to which it belongs. A wider and deeper knowledge of what has been said, during more than two thousand years, upon the themes he handles, if it had not served to enrich and chasten his current of thought, would, at least, have taught him a much needed lesson of self-distrust.

Sir William Hamilton possessed many qualities which rendered him the ablest metaphysician in England, during his day. His learning was immense. His faculty of analysis and generalization has scarcely ever been surpassed. His devotion to his favorite science amounted to an enthusiasm. His candor, his love of truth, his regard for rival genius, were excelled only by his gentleness of disposition. His *Essay on the Philosophy*

of the Unconditioned, is admitted on all hands to be one of singular power and distinctness. Not a few of the ablest minds who have controverted its positions, have nevertheless freely declared it to be the most remarkable contribution to the philosophical literature of England made in our time. And yet, Mr. Jones, a novice and a fledgeling in Metaphysics, deals with Sir William, at times, very much as a learned and veteran professor would deal with a crude and blundering scholar. He is amazed at Sir William's *faux pas*, exclaims at his unaccountable absurdities, and grows almost facetious over the exposure of the weaknesses of his logic.

Quite in the same temper is his handling of Dr. Mansel and Herbert Spencer. There is something in the air and port of this Book, which savors of the assumption that "the coming man" has arrived. The writer is a good specimen of the character produced by the chronic speculative habit of the New England mind. He is not *sui generis*. He is a growth, and belongs to a species. But in spite of his ignorance, crudeness and presumption, Mr. Jones has merit. He shows the freshness, vigor and pertinacity of an enthusiast in the department of thought to which he has devoted his energies. He has an evident aptitude for metaphysical studies. He grasps the questions before him firmly, and discusses them with an acuteness and general ability seldom seen in so unpractised a thinker. He possesses, moreover, in a very considerable degree, that most desirable and needed gift in Metaphysical writers, the capacity to move among the shadows of abstract thought, as though they were the tangible realities of the hour.

It is the object of this work to refute and demolish Mansel's "Limits of Religious Thought," and Herbert Spencer's "First Principles," &c. But to do this, the writer must first destroy the metaphysical foundation on which they rest, viz., Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy of the Infinite and Absolute. We cannot enter into the details of the assault. The battle between Sir William and his assailants is really a battle between rival psychological theories, which, in substance, have antagonized since the days of Plato and Aristotle. It is a contest for premises. The question turns upon what the human

mind is, and can do. In the Psychology of Sir William, the Understanding is the highest and the only faculty of positive intellectual truth. It is the source, and the master, of all truth capable of logical expression. It works *under* finite conditions, *on* finite forms, and is, *in itself*, the finite faculty of a finite being. There is nothing in the human mind in the shape of thought, or feeling, instinct, or intuition, which can enable this faculty to transcend these conditions and limitations. As a faculty of reasoning, it can deal only with things related and limited. Logically, all that is not related and limited, is simply *unthinkable*, and beyond the reach of human measurement and criticism.* He admits the existence of an instinct or feeling, which compels a belief in the Infinite; but denies that it so exists as to be capable of logical use. From these premises, the inference is irresistible, that the human mind can neither construct out of itself the idea, or logically formulate, as positive knowledge, the conception of the Infinite; or, in other words, that the Infinite can never be Known, except as that which we *cannot* embrace.

Now this theory, presented by Sir William Hamilton with a fullness and power which leave nothing to be added, can be successfully controverted only by another psychology, which shall prove that it has not exhaustively mapped out the human mind, or enumerated all its powers and capabilities. The writer of this work undertakes the task of furnishing this other Psychology, and of demonstrating its validity. In doing so, though he exhibits much dialectic talent, he proves himself only a fresh recruit in an old and numerous school of thinkers. To the traditional views of this school, he has added nothing, either in matter or in statement. He goes to work, with a charming simplicity, at a fabric which has been built over a hundred times, and that by the master builders of metaphysical literature. The view he presents is, in all essential particulars, that made so familiar to the English mind by the philosophical writings of Coleridge; and previously, to the German mind by a long line of illustrious thinkers. It is the theory of the *a priori* school of thought, whose great and fundamental characteristic is, the distinction between the Understanding and

the Reason. According to this theory, the Understanding is the ox, and the Reason is the Pegasus harnessed to it. The Understanding does the grosser, heavier work of the mind, plods on slowly and wearily in the furrows ploughed up by the Senses, analyzes and generalizes, gathers, combines, deduces, wears leaden shoes which hold it to the earth, grinds coarse grist in the mill of those irksome limitations, called time and space.

To the Reason, sometimes termed the "pure Reason," sometimes the "impersonal Reason," sometimes the "faculty of Intuitions," sometimes "the Revealer within us," "the divine teacher," "the organ of the Absolute,"—to this, are assigned the more ethereal and refined tasks of the Intellect. It is not only the repository of the ideas which constitute the laws of thought, but the faculty which supervises their application to the current operations of the mind. It is the source of all axiomatic truths,—all knowledge accruing independently of reasoning and experience. To it must be referred all mental affirmations possessed of the attributes of necessity and universality. It is the root and ground of the distinction between the animal nature and the spiritual person in man. It is common to and the same in all men. It is, moreover, in such a sense, a part or image of the universal and absolute Reason,—that, according to some thinkers of this school,—our author among them,—subject and object, the Creator and the creature, the thinking principle and the thing thought, are, or may become one. The Reason, as thus defined, is a transcendental faculty, which, at a bound, leaps the gulf which separates the Finite from the Infinite. It knows God by immediate vision. It grasps the Absolute and Unconditioned at once, without intervening processes, and as an essential element of its own being.

Assuming this to be the true Psychology of the human mind,—assuming that there is in us the faculty which has been described, and that, if there, it is under no eclipse, which blinds its sight,—opposed by no hindrance which paralyzes any portion of its innate power,—all this once admitted, and a philosophy of the Infinite, a positive knowledge of the Absolute Being as a product of such philosophy, and serviceable

for the criticism of the contents of any Revelation claiming to proceed from that Being, is not only a thing possible, but a thing of certain attainment.

Now, it is not our purpose to discuss, or to pronounce any judgment upon, these antagonizing schemes of Psychology. For the present, we have another object in view. We may remark, however, in passing, that a careful study of the history of philosophical inquiry will show, that the profoundest thinkers, the real masters, the founders of Schools, the conceded rulers over the intellectual tendencies of the race, have taken sides in this controversy under the influence of their mental temperament, rather than of formal reasoning. The Schools represented by these opposing views of the nature and limits of the human mind, have always existed, and while human nature continues to be what it is, always will exist. There will ever be those who will insist upon starting at the lowest point of thought and being, and working up, by analysis and generalization, to the summit. There will ever be those, who will insist upon reversing this process,—upon commencing with *a priori* principles,—with what is termed the intuitional faculty; with the primordial laws and ideas which are believed to be given through that faculty, and working down through all the phenomena of being. In thought, as in everything else, like begets like. Plato and Aristotle survive, to-day, in an offspring which shall never cease from the earth. They are ever recurring in the Bernards and Abelards, the Lockes and Kants, the Coleridges and Hamiltons, of the successive generations of mankind. In spite of all logic, controversy and periodic adjudications of the great issue, there will ever be those who *will believe that they may know*, and those who will *know that they may believe*.

Now, it is upon the *a priori* scheme,—upon the basis of the Reason, as the faculty of intuitions and first principles, and therefore the faculty competent to build up a positive knowledge of the Infinite, that our author, after the example of the *dii majores* who have gone before him, assails the Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, and through that, the teachings of Mansel's "Limits of Religious Thought," and Herbert Spen-

cer's "First Principles." He conducts the assault with vigor and acuteness. His Book contains passages of sustained, coherent reasoning, upon the most difficult problems, which would do credit to an older and better trained intellect. And yet it exhibits, in many places, a dogmatic, undoubting, presumptuous, and almost rude assurance, in deciding questions, as though without the possibility of appeal ;—questions which ever have remained, and always must remain open, and, on which the human mind has pronounced no judgment even approaching unanimity. The writer has, moreover, drawn so much upon Dr. Hickock's "Rational Psychology," as seriously to disturb his claim to originality in matter and method. At not a few of the great angles in the course of his thought, Dr. H. appears and reappears, as his accepted mentor. Though liberal acknowledgment is made of indebtedness to this able writer, yet many readers will feel that it would have been better for Mr. Jones to have made less use of other people's legs, in walking over the difficult portions of the field, or to have been less complacent and self-assured over the fruits of his imagined success.

We have alluded to his tone and bearing toward the authors with whom he deals. We can readily imagine what a tempting morsel this book would have proved to the critical mind of Sir William Hamilton, had he thought it worthy of a rejoinder. It takes so much for granted that has not been adequately proved ; it has so many loose points ; it so innocently drops here and there a link in the chain of its argument ; it sticks so closely to logic, where logic will serve the purpose in hand, and then so unsuspectingly sets it adrift, where it is likely to be troublesome—amiably falling back on the *a priori*, the intuitional, the things of vision, insight, which, because they are such, are above argument ;—this book, we repeat, has just enough of these unconscious weaknesses and fallibilities, to have afforded Sir William an amusing exercise of his logical talent, in reducing it to a shapeless pulp. We fancy that we hear the heavy blows of his mailed hand upon Mr. Jones's *a priori* construction of the Deity ; upon his propositions respecting the only sense in which conditions can be imposed upon

the Absolute ; upon his definition and use of the laws of Consciousness as applied to the Infinite ; upon his argument in regard to the identity of subject and object, in the mind of God and in the mind of man ; upon his theory of the pure Reason, as a practical, positive, conscious power, in the ordinary processes of logic ; upon his scheme of "intuited" truths, about whose actual number and individual authority, the disciples of this School have never been able to agree. If not convinced of error, or led to distrust some of his conclusions, we are persuaded Mr. Jones would come forth humbled and chastened, from such a conflict with the great speculative genius, whose labors he so complacently disparages and believes himself to have demolished.

But this whole region of thought is of interest to us, chiefly, for its Theological bearings. Some persons are fond of decrying Metaphysical studies, because of their alleged impractical character. The experience of the last thirty years, to take no longer period, is enough to silence such critics. It is one of the remarkable features of the time, that those who delve in the deep places of abstract thought, are brought almost hand to hand with those who guide the practical forces on the surface of every day life. Wise men no longer esteem it of little account what or how the Metaphysician may think. All teachers and preachers who are alive to their work, know how their task is helped or hindered by the temper and aims of abstract Philosophy. Unspeculative, fixed and authentical as may be the Theology and Ethics of Christianity, there runs all through them a connecting, sympathetic nerve, which reaches down into the realm of speculation, and reports at once each new phasis or modification of the current thinking.

Sir William Hamilton is hardly through with his attempted solution of some of the deepest problems of thought and being, before the results at which he arrived, the philosophy which he elaborated, is caught up and applied, by Mr. Mansel, to discussions affecting most vitally the relations of the individual Reason to the whole province of Revealed Truth. In like manner, the leaders of the *a priori*, Intuitional Philosophy, make no move that does not at once re-appear in the tone of a

half-dozen Schools of Biblical criticism. When we say, therefore, that we are chiefly interested in these rival systems of Metaphysics, because of their theological bearings, we only say, in reality, that our main interest in them begins just at the point where they are earliest clothed with practical power.

Now, as to the quality and degree of the influence exerted upon Faith and Morals, by the Philosophy which underlies Mr. Mansel's *Limits of Religious Thought*, Mr. Jones adopts in full the whole vocabulary of censure used by the "Pure Reason," "Intuitionist" School to which he belongs. He has no patience with the *Limitists*, as he terms the followers of Hamilton and Mansel. He indicts them for "high crimes and misdemeanors" against the interests of Philosophy and Religion. He charges them with advocating views of the Human Mind which annihilate its hold upon God, either through a faithful Reason or a Reasonable Faith. He arraigns them for presenting a phenomenal, not the real God;—a God who offers to his creatures, not Truth in its absolute nature and relations, but merely partial statements of Truth; a God whose moral attributes, as set forth in Revelation, are subjective notions, rather than objective realities; a God utterly inconceivable, and because absolute and infinite, incapable of all distinctions and limitations, without which the Reason cannot affirm his personality. According to these *Limitists*, we are not only to believe where we can have no possible conception of the thing believed, but where there is a declared chance of delusion. The reasoning of Mansel, it is urged, plunges both the friends and the foes of Religion, into hopeless obscurity; and places the human Intellect, in all its relations to Deity, upon an inclined plane, where there is no logical *break* that can prevent its descent into sheer scepticism. He represents God to be so completely unknowable and unthinkable as to sweep away the very grounds of belief in His revealed existence. Revelation is carried so far beyond all possible, valid, critical judgment of the mind, as to deprive it of practical power over the mind. The proffered light is made to fall upon a dwarfed, crippled, and sightless orb; and thus is made of no more value than darkness itself.

Now these charges may be wholly or only partly true, though Mr. Mansel, in replying to his assailants, has frequently denied them all. This we shall not attempt to decide. But, surely, we have a right to expect, from those who attack him with so much vehemence, and sound so dreadful an alarm at the dangers which his system threatens, a safer and a better Science upon the great subject of the relations of Reason to Revelation. If we accept our author as a fair representative of the School to which he belongs, this expectation will prove groundless. He warns us against one set of perils, only to lead us into another. To say the least, the pitfalls and chasms in his scheme are quite as numerous and as hazardous as those in the system which he labors to overthrow. It is the old story of Scylla and Charybdis. He gives us a view of Reason which, if it does not degrade Revelation, lifts Reason to a level with it. He clothes Reason in the robe of pride, and puts into its hand the sceptre of universal sovereignty. He tells it to go forth, in its unborrowed strength, and grasp the absolute. He declares the Infinite to be an object of positive knowledge, and the proper material of rational thought; and of the Infinite, then, by necessary consequence, whatever proceeds from it,—Religion, Revelation, Morality,—finds its measure and test in the intelligence that receives it. "Ages of controversy," we are told, "have failed to cry down the spontaneous utterance of the soul," "*I have within myself the ultimate standard of Truth.*" After speaking of mathematical ideas and axioms, as known by us, he tells us, "From this it follows, in this instance, that human knowledge is *exhaustive*, and so *equal* to the Deity's knowledge." Again, after reasoning out the matter to his satisfaction, our author does not hesitate to announce the conclusion, that Space and Time must have the necessity of being that God has. "They *must* be as He *must* be;" adding, what is undoubtedly true,—"The devout Religious soul will start, perhaps, at some of the positions stated above." Still again, he lays it down as a fundamental principle, that "sometimes, in the created spiritual person, and *always* in the self-existent, the absolute and infinite spiritual person, *the subject and object are IDENTICAL*;" i. e., God is the universe, and the universe is God;

God is man, and man is God. But why push the inference? It is Pantheism, pure and simple.

This author sometimes writes with ability, force, and discrimination, but oftener, without a due comprehension of the inevitable bearings of his logic. He writes as a defender of truth, in its highest interests and applications, and such we believe him to aspire to be. But unless he shall be led to revise his reasonings, to renounce some articles of his creed, and to alter his tone of self-sufficiency in discussing the most perplexed and perplexing themes which can engage the human mind, he will become one of those damaging defenders, from whom Religion, in her relations to Philosophy, will pray to be delivered.

In the second part of his Book, the author exposes and refutes, with much acuteness and force, some of the errors of Herbert Spencer's "First Principles." But, as this work has been so recently examined in these pages, we need not extend our notice to this branch of his labors.

ART. VI.—BISHOP POTTER'S PASTORAL LETTER AND ITS CAUSES.

- (1.) *Rev. Dr. A. H. Vinton's Speech before the Christian Union Association, May 14, 1865.*
- (2.) *Rev. Dr. Vermilye, in the New York Observer, Nov. 16th, 1865.*
- (3.) *Report of the American Christian Commission, at Cleveland, Ohio, Sept. 27th, 1865.*

IN a previous Number of this Review, we took occasion to examine, with some care, the Pastoral Letter lately issued by the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of New York, the immediate causes or occasions which called for it, and the attacks at once made upon the Bishop and his Pastoral, in way of reply to it. To what was then said upon this aspect of the subject, we have nothing now to add. It is evident, however, that this late outbreak of radicalism among us is not the real evil to be remedied. It is an index, an unmistakeable symptom, or manifestation. The real trouble to be removed is far more deeply seated. We can prevent, in the future, the recurrence of these external disorders and irregularities, for we have the munitions of positive Law, wherewith to defend the Church from foes without and foes within ; and those munitions are all that we need to that end.

It is, however, with the primary causes of these disorders that, as Churchmen, and thoughtful men, we are now most concerned. The great question, which lies back of all other questions on this subject, is, What is the Church ? or, more strictly, What is the Form and Order of the Church ? and then, What is the true basis of Unity in the Church ? It is on this aspect of the subject that we propose now to offer a few considerations. The papers placed at the head of our pages, will form the subject of our reflections. The Speech of the Rev. Dr. Vinton, to which we first call the reader's atten-

tion, embodies so completely the fundamental error on this subject of Church Organization, that we will first examine it somewhat minutely, and in several of its natural bearings and connections. He is reported to have spoken as follows :—

“The early history of the Church had terminated in producing one, united, Christian organization, and the result was, slumber and death. On awaking again to religious consciousness, variety recommenced, with the glorious Reformation. He went back to the Saviour's prayer for Unity. What sort of Unity was there prayed for?—“Thou in Me, and I in Thee,”—the sort of Unity that existed between God the Father, and Christ Himself. That was not an *organic* Unity, it did not mean *identity of form*. That prayer was from the Human Mediator to the Divine Father, so that there was no Unity of form, or of Nature (though in another point of view there was, of course, the substratum of a common nature between God the Father and God the Son). But in the interpretation of that prayer, it was evident that the only Unity intended, was a Unity of heart, of mind, of purpose. We were positively hedged in to just that conclusion, that a moral, spiritual, internal, vital, but not organic Unity, was all that was intended by our Lord, and that was *precisely such a Unity as already exists, binding all Evangelical denominations together in one*. All truly regenerate souls partook of this life, and this Unity. Besides that one text, there was no where else in Scripture any warrant for the notion of an organic Unity. The Unity which we already enjoy is the only Unity contemplated in the Bible.”

Dr. Vinton also illustrated his theory of “Unity” from Nature. “Vegetable life,” he said, was “one principle; but there was infinite diversity, from the spear of grass to the California cedar, and *all independent of one another*.” So also, in a Sermon published a while since, by the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, the preacher advanced the same identical theory of Unity, and made use of the very same illustrations.

Now, with superficial and unthinking minds, an illustration is always better than an argument. But the objection to the illustration in this case is, that it is no illustration at all. It may illustrate Dr. Vinton's notion, and Henry Ward Beecher's notion of Church Unity, but that notion is not the Scriptural and true notion.

Let us stop for a moment, and see where this theory of Unity had its origin. At the time of the Reformation, when the reaction against the usurpations and corruptions of Popery began and rushed to the opposite extreme, when Rome hurled

her fierce anathemas against all who protested against her horrible corruptions ; when everything pertaining to Church Order and Government, was eclipsed by the over-shadowing despotism ; when the Episcopate, long stripped of its rightful prerogatives, had become a mere vassal to the Papacy, and had lost the consciousness of its true place and dignity ; when the English Reformers, by diligent study of Holy Scripture and ancient authors, learned the true basis of Catholic Reform ; when, all around them, Presbyterianism, and Independency, and Erastianism, and Quakerism, and all those Sects, "licentiously wild and daringly blasphemous," as a Presbyterian historian styles them, sprang up ; and then, when John Calvin came forward with his new philosophical definition of the Church, the Church of the "Elect," the purchase of Christ's Limited Atonement, the Invisible Church as the only true Church ;—then it is, and there it is, that we find the source of that modern notion of Christianity which New England Puritans brought over to this country, and which, from them, has crept into so many of our own pulpits, and Theological Seminaries, and into so much of the popular Church Literature of the day. It is a false and un-Scriptural theory. It is a modern theory. It is a mischievous theory. These are the points which we propose now to prove.

It is a false theory. The lowest conceivable idea of a Church, must suppose it to be a Visible, and not an invisible Body. The word *ecclesia*, in the Greek language, in its original meaning, signifies an *assembly* of men. This, the simplest meaning of the word, must suppose the existence of that which is visible. This definition applies to all assemblies or associations of men. The English Parliament is an *assembly* of men associated for a special object. The American Congress is an *assembly* of men convened for a particular purpose. Hence we can, with as much propriety, conceive or speak of the English Parliament as an invisible Parliament, or the American Congress as an invisible Congress, as we can conceive of the Church of Christ as being an invisible Church. While man remains a visible being, every Church or assembly, composed of such men, must be visible. And when we speak of invisible bodies, and yet those bodies composed of constituent parts, which

must, in the nature of things, be visible, we speak of that which is, from the nature of the case, an absurdity. The Church, therefore, as composed of visible men, must itself be a Visible Body.

It is an un-Scriptural theory. In the Holy Scriptures, the Church militant is spoken of not as an invisible, but a Visible Body. In the writings of the New Testament, the Greek word, *ecclesia*, translated in our version Church, occurs one hundred and fourteen times. In three instances only, that word retains its original secular meaning, and is translated assembly. In the remaining one hundred and eleven instances, it refers to the Church of Christ, and is so translated. It is employed sometimes in the singular, sometimes in the plural number. It refers sometimes to the Church in a single house; as to the Church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila. Rom. xvi. 3. Sometimes to the Church in a city and its neighborhood; as "the Church of God which is at Corinth." I. Cor. i. 2. Sometimes it refers to the Churches in a whole country; as "John to the seven Churches which are in Asia." Rev. i. 4. And sometimes it refers to the Church of God on earth, as a unity, as one whole; as "on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. xvi. 18. It is specially noticeable, that in the great majority of instances in which this word occurs in the New Testament, it must, of necessity, refer to the Church as a Visible, and not an invisible body; and what is equally deserving attention, *not one solitary instance can be found in the whole New Testament, where the Church of Christ on earth is referred to as necessarily an Invisible Church.* In several cases, the Church is so spoken of, as not to bear at all upon the question, either of its visibility or invisibility. The following are examples of Scriptural usage. In the case of the brother who hath trespassed, the final direction is, "Tell it unto the Church, but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." Matt. xviii. 18. Was the Church of God, to which, in all ages, appeal should be made in case of discipline, spoken of as visible or invisible? Again, we are told that "Saul of Tarsus made havoc of the Church, entering into

every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison." Acts viii. 3. Was the Church, which Saul of Tarsus thus cruelly assailed, visible or invisible? And yet it was that same Church, which St. Paul afterwards spoke of as a whole, when he said, "I am not meet to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God." I. Cor. xv. 9.

Is the Church spoken of in such passages as the following, Visible, or Invisible?

"At that time there was a great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem." Acts viii. 1.

"Then had the Churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee." Acts ix. 31.

"Tidings of these things came unto the ears of the Church which was in Jerusalem." Acts ii. 22.

"Prayer was made without ceasing of the Church unto God for him." Acts xii. 5.

"Being brought on their way by the Church." Acts xv. 3.

"Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders with the whole Church." Acts xv. 22.

"Let not the Church be charged." I. Tim. v. 15.

"Let him call for the Elders of the Church." James v. 14.

"I wrote unto the Church," &c. III. John, ix. 5.

In all these instances, the Church of God is spoken of in such a manner as necessarily to imply its Visibility. And yet, these are only specimens of Scriptural testimony on the subject.

Another argument proving the Visibility of the Church is, that the prerogatives, duties and ordinances, universally conceded as belonging to the Church, assume the Visibility of the Church as a settled point. It is one prerogative of the Church to administer discipline. Must not the body which inflicts that discipline be a Visible Body? It is one duty of the Church, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Must not the instrumentality by which such results are accomplished, be a Visible instrumentality? One institution of the Church is its Ministry; another, its Sacraments. Do not these necessarily imply the visibility of that body of which these are the appointed visible Institutions? It is one office of the Church to offer up unto

God the sacrifices of prayer, praise and thanksgiving. Do not these, as offered by creatures like ourselves, necessarily suppose the Visibility of the Church, upon whose Altars they ascend? Dr. Vinton's theory has, therefore, not even the shadow of Scriptural sanction.

We prove the Visibility of the Church, by the general consent of Christians in modern times. On this point, we quote a modern writer, who fortifies his statement by abundant references and quotations :*

"The Confession of Augsburg denies that all ceremonies, all old institutions were abolished in their Churches, (Conf. August., part i. xxii.) evidently understanding visible societies. The Saxon Confession says that the Church may be seen and heard, according to that text, 'their sound went into all the world,' and that there is a Visible Church in which God operates† The Bohemian Confession, approved by Luther,‡ the Confession of the Reformed of Strasburg,§ the Helvetic Confession,|| that of Basil, in 1536, (Art. xiv., xv.); the Gallican Confession, (Gall. xxvii.) all speak repeatedly of the Church as essentially Visible. This was also the doctrine of Calvin, who declares that out of the *Visible* Church, there is no salvation.¶ So, also, the Presbyterian divines say : 'The Visible Church, which is also Catholic or universal, under the Gospel, consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.'**

"And Dr. Owen, the chief of English Independents of the seventeenth century, believes in 'a *Visible* Catholic Church;'†† and says, also, 'that the union of the Catholic Church in all particular Churches is *always* the same, unchangeable, comprehending all the Churches in the world, *at all times*, . . . nor to be prevailed against by the gates of hell.‡‡

"So also the English and American Churches declare, that 'the *Visible* Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered.' "§§

Such is the opinion of the leading modern denominations of Christendom. It is not necessary to quote the teaching of the

* Palmer on the Church, Vol. I., pp. 53, 4, 5.

† Conf. Saxon., Art. xii.

‡ Conf. Bohemica, Cap. viii.

§ Conf. Tetrapolit., Cap. xvi. 16.

|| Conf. Helv., Cap. xvii.

¶ Inst., iv. Sec. 4.

** Pres. Con. of Faith ch. xxv. s. 2.

†† Owen's "True Nature of a Gospel Church," p. 50.

‡‡ Ibid., p. 403.

§§ Art. xix.

Primitive Church, or of the Eastern and Western Churches, on such a subject ; for with them it has never been an open question, or a matter of dispute.

While, however, the true Church of God on earth is a Visible Body, this does not prove that all the members of that Visible Church are its living members, or will attain salvation. On the contrary, the Holy Scriptures, and the experience of the Church in all ages, bear testimony, that "they are not all Israel who are of Israel." Rom. ix. 6. There may be dead branches even upon a living vine. John xv. 5. There always have been, and are now, "tares in the midst of the wheat." Matt. xiii. 26. The net which was cast into the sea and drawn ashore, contained both the good and the bad. Matt. xiii. 47. By such repeated illustrations, we are taught that in the Church there will be both worthy and unworthy members. So it has been from the days of Judas and the eleven Apostles ; and so it doubtless will be, until the chaff shall be finally separated from the wheat. "Let both grow together until the harvest," said our Saviour, "lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up the wheat also." Matt. xiii. 29.

Nor is this all. By the visibility of the Church, a great object was to be gained in the world. As Bishop Butler says :—

"A *Visible Church* was established, in order to continue (Christianity) and carry it on successively throughout all ages. Had Moses and the Prophets, Christ and His Apostles, only taught, and by miracles proved Religion to their contemporaries, the benefit of their instructions would have reached but to a small part of mankind. Christianity must have been in a great degree sunk and forgot in a very few ages. To prevent this, appears to have been one reason why a *Visible Church* was instituted ; to be like a city upon a hill, a standing memorial to the world, of the duty which we owe our Maker ; to call men continually, both by precept and instruction, to attend to it, and by the form of religion ever before their eyes, remind them of the reality ; to be the repository of the Oracles of God ; to hold up the light of Revelation in aid of that of Nature, and propagate it throughout all generations to the end of the world."*

The Holy Scriptures teach, not only the Visibility of the Church, but, also, the Unity of that Visible Church. They teach it by direct affirmation. The Inspired Apostle says :—

* Butler's Analogy, p. ii., ch. I.

"By one Spirit are we all baptized into *One Body*." I. Cor. xii. 13.
And again: "*There is One Body*, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all." Eph. iv. 4, 5.

Again: "As we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, *so we, being many, are One Body in Christ*." Rom. xii. 4, 5.

Again: "*That He might reconcile both unto God, in one Body, by the Cross*." Eph. ii. 16.

Neither is this one Body a mass of isolated, disjointed, disconnected fragments. For St. Paul speaks of the Church as a "building fitly framed together." And he describes the coherence or connection of the parts of this Body still more particularly, when he says:—

"When He (Christ) ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . and He gave some Apostles; and some prophets; and some Evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints; for the work of the ministry; for the edifying of the Body of Christ."

And he also speaks of the office which these "gifts" of Christ sustain, in binding His Body together. For he says:—

"Speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ, from Whom the whole Body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body, unto the edifying of itself in love." Eph. iv. 8; 11, 12; 15, 16.

Thus the "gifts" of God, before enumerated, are the ligaments, the joints and bands which bind this one Body compactly and strongly together.

So, also, this one Body thus knit compactly together, has many members, and these members sustain different relations to each other. Thus the Apostle says:—

"God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles; then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." I. Cor. xii. 28.

And yet, these parts are members one of another, are necessary to each other, and share in each other's prosperity.

"If the foot shall say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it, therefore, not

of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now God hath set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him And the eye cannot say unto the hand I have no need of thee; nor again, the head to the foot, I have no need of thee. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." I. Cor. xii. 15-18; 21-26.

The Unity of the Church is taught in those Scriptures, where Divisions and Schisms are expressly forbidden. The Apostle, writing to the Church at Corinth, found cause for rebuke in their divisions, which he thus reproves:—

"Now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing; and *that there be no divisions* (or Schisms) among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, 'I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ?' Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" I. Cor. i. 10-12, 13.

The Apostle could not have more directly condemned the divisions of modern Christendom, even if he had had them distinctly in his eye.

Another, perhaps the strongest Scriptural argument for the Visible Unity of the Church, is found in the Prayer of the Blessed Saviour Himself, in behalf of His Church:—

"And now, I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given me, *that they may be one as we are.*

"Neither pray I for these alone; *but for them also which shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one.*

"As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me." St. John xvii. 11, 20-23.

Such is the Scriptural argument for the Visible Unity of the Church of Christ. It is taught in the strongest possible manner, by direct affirmation. Divisions, such as we see all about us, are distinctly, and in the strongest possible language, disapproved. Hence the violation of that Unity is wrong. In

other words, *Schism* is a *Sin*. It breaks up that which God established. It disobeys that which Christ commands. It sunders those joints and ligaments which God hath appointed. It arrays itself against both the letter and the spirit of our Saviour's Prayer. It frustrates one great object which our Saviour teaches us He would accomplish by that Unity, the victory of the truth over an unbelieving world.

We reach now another point of great moment. The Visibility, and hence, the Visible Unity of the Church, is addressed to the necessities of our spiritual nature; and is the only theory on which the Church can ever be built up. Deny the Visibility of the Church, and one great end and object of the Church is lost. Bishop Butler has stated this point in the extract already given. The *Church idea* is ignored, and its power is gone. Its loss will be felt in every way. It is morally impossible that a man, with his two-fold nature, should give the warm gushing sympathies of his heart to an invisibility. The whole mystery of the God-Man has one of its great objects in this man's two-fold nature; and Christ met the necessities of that same nature in and by His Church.

The loss of the *Church idea* will be felt even in the temporalities of the Church. Such things as Endowments for Church Schools, Church Colleges, Church Seminaries, Church Homes and Hospitals, will be withheld, and are withheld, to-day, for no other reason than that the *Church idea* has lost its hold upon the minds and hearts even of Churchmen. They have wealth, and they give it freely, lavishly, to every thing else; they do not give it to the suffering, pleading charities of the Church. The great English Christian Universities, the secret of England's power, were never founded in such a day as this.

The loss will be felt upon the spiritualities of the Church. It robs the Ordinances of the Church of their obligation. Men desert them with conscious impunity. "I want no one to stand between me and my God;" says one. "One place is as sacred as another;" repeats a second. "Religion is not a thing of Sacraments and outward forms, the heart is the great thing;" echoes a third. Now all this may be a very comfortable religion for such an age as this, an age of sensual indulgence,

an age of self-will, an age of materialistic philosophy, an age of worldly pomp and show, an age of baptized idolatry of gold, an age of faithlessness,—but it fritters away positive divine institutions of Christ, into powerless unrealities. It is not the spirit or the letter of those inspired words which the Church, following her great Head, teaches us to use :—

“Blessed are they that dwell in thy house; they will be always praising thee.

“My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God.

“We will go into his tabernacle, and fall low on our knees before his footstool.

“For the Lord hath chosen Sion to be an habitation for himself; he hath longed for her.

“This shall be my rest forever: here will I dwell, for I have a delight therein.

“Such as are planted in the house of the Lord, shall flourish in the courts of the house of our God.

“Glory and worship are before him; power and honor are in his sanctuary.

“Ascribe unto the Lord the honor due unto his name; bring presents, and come into his courts.

“If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.

“If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; yea, if I prefer not Jerusalem in my mirth.”

Let us look at this modern theory of the Church, in some of its practical results. Not far from us, and on a certain Avenue of this great city, stand, a little distance from each other, two Churches; one, Protestant Episcopal, the other, Romish. Both were kept open for Sunday Services during the sweltering heat of the last Summer months. At the first named Church, the attendance was beggarly; scarcely sufficient to render the “dearly beloved” a fitting exhortation. It may be said, that some or most of the stated worshippers were out of the city. But the Church is in the midst of a dense Protestant population, who now attend Church, even on Sunday, no where, but spend its holy hours, habitually, in sleep, or in frivolous reading, or in rambling over the pleasure-grounds of the metropolis. On a single Sunday, 36,752 pedestrians, and on another, 5,151 vehicles, were officially reported as being in Centra. Park alone,

and the number is constantly increasing. Meanwhile, the Protestant "Churches" are more and more deserted.

But how was it at the Romish Church? The Church edifice alluded to was bought of the Presbyterians; who, it should be noticed, are giving up one position after another, amid this swarming population. There are, at this Romish Church, four or five Services on each Lord's-day. Each of these is attended by a distinct class of people; but all classes go to one or another of these Services. The crowds on crowds who flock to that Church at each of these hours, and the few scattering worshippers who stray into our own venerable Church,—this is the fact to be explained. It has its meaning. What is that meaning? All this in New York.

So, also, modern New England Puritans are startled, at times, at discovering that their Sunday Services are fast becoming deserted; and wonder what the secret can be. Such facts as the following are divulged constantly; and they are terribly significant:—

"In a report made to the General Association of Massachusetts, June 24, 1858, by a Committee, of which Rev. Dr. Copp, of Chelsea, was the Chairman, it was stated, that according to statistical information recently gathered, embracing Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Massachusetts, there were not far from two millions of people outside of our churches every Sabbath, and thirteen hundred thousand had no more to do with the sanctuary of God than the Heathen. These facts were so startling, that many of our clergymen objected to their publication, lest injury should be done."

The (Boston) *Tract Journal* for Jan., 1861, has a Quarterly Report from one of the Colporteurs of that Society, in which we find the following:—

"A Congregational Clergyman recently stated, in a Ministerial meeting at P., that, of the twelve thousand inhabitants of S., G. and B., not one thousand were regular attendants on Sabbath worship. The Church-going people of J., nearly all of S., and F., might safely be estimated in the same ratio. Indeed, I doubt whether, of the nearly thirty thousand people who make up the population of the above towns, two thousand would not be fully up to the average of the actual number who assemble in all the School Houses and Churches on the Lord's day."

Look at another fact. The Church has appointed a "Daily Service" for her children. There are, in this City, thousands

on thousands of Communicants, who, amidst the constant distractions and allurements of the world, need such a Service to bring the influence of Religion to bear upon their daily life. Many of them are craving such a privilege, and would hail it with gratitude. The same is true in all our large cities and towns. There is time enough for everything else. There is a Daily Opera, and a Daily Theatre; and even baptized Communicants flock to them. Now it is, undoubtedly, an easier thing to hold to the "Invisible Church" theory, and to forget the vows of our Baptism, in which we pledged ourselves to "renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them." It is an easier thing to spend all one's daily and weekly life, in the whirl of business, or in literary leisure, or in worldly pleasure, than it is to follow the discipline of the Church. But who, as a matter of fact, "loves Jesus" most? not in word; but in deed and in truth; they who do, or they who do not imitate the example of primitive Christians, and follow the teachings of our own Church? That is the question.

There is no mystery in all this neglect of Church Ordinances. The whole secret lies in that false conception of Christianity itself, which has obtained among us. The *Church idea* is lost. The binding obligation of Church Ordinances is forgotten, or ignored, or denied. In its place, there is the presence and power of that wretched sophistry, by which alone such a delusion can be defended, and Protestant Christianity is withering away, and fast losing its hold upon the people, under its influence; while Romanism is making rapid advances, and already boasting of the future.

We have said, that a Visible Church, with all its divine appointments, is suited to the necessities of our spiritual nature. When the God-Man established His Mystical Body, the Church, and promised the Comforter to abide in It forever, He knew what was in man; his yearnings for sympathy, his sense of weakness, his consciousness of guilt, his forebodings of the future. There are periods in the spiritual life of every

man, when a sense of deep unrest, from one, or another, or all of these causes, takes possession of the soul. Call it weakness, or infirmity, or what we will, it is an overpowering reality. The Church, Christ's Mystical Body, He Himself established to be to such an agonized spirit, at such an hour, all that that spirit needs ; to speak, at such a moment, as He Himself spake, "with authority." Draw this line as closely as we may, and ought, between this authority of the Church and its abuses, still the authority itself is there ; and that form of professed Christianity which cannot deal with such a soul, at such an hour, is impotent to meet real wants, and will be distrusted and abandoned. Here is one great secret of Rome's success in gaining and holding minds at certain periods in their religious history. Rome claims to be something ; something positive ; and to be altogether in earnest. She professes to speak with authority, to doubting, trembling spirits. Now, evade this matter as we like, there is, beyond question, such a Church on earth, somewhere ; or Christ's words were a delusion. If Dr. Vinton is right in his theory, the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country cannot, by any possibility, claim to be that Church ; and he, of course, throws the argument, at once, into the hands of Rome.

Let us test this modern theory in another way. According to that theory, the only real and true proof of membership in the Church, is a certain subjective emotion. To this, the private Christian is continually pointed. At this, he is bid perpetually to strive ; not only as being the great thing, but the only thing. It is "faith." Or it is "love of Jesus." Or it is a "conscious sense of pardon and acceptance." It is, as an evidence, always something within himself ; not something without. And yet, this habit of spiritual anatomy, this perpetual introspection, this constant watching for frames, and moods, and feelings, is, for many reasons, a most unreliable process ; and is, withal, full of temptation to the individual himself. It leads him, either to the wretchedness of doubt or despair, on the one hand ; or to a dangerous excess of self-conscious satisfaction on the other. It tends to indolence and self-indulgence. It begets, even at best, that dreamy quietistic habit of soul, which

undervalues and overlooks active duty. Above all, it robs the Christian of those visible Signs and Seals, those appointed Means of Grace, which are suited to our two-fold nature, and which Christ has appointed in His Church for our spiritual aid and comfort.

We do not underestimate subjective emotion. It has its true place and value. It is at Mount Calvary, not Mount Sinai, at the Cross, not under or by the Law, that all true peace of the soul springs and grows. But it is the obedience of faith,—it is the subjection of the human will to the Divine Will, which, alone, can claim the promise. “If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.” (John iii. 17.) “He that hath My Commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me * * * and I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him.” (John xiv. 21.) Here is the true test of “love to Jesus.” On the other hand, that test of love which rejects works and Ordinances, moral and ceremonial, and relies only on subjective moods, and frames of feeling, not unfrequently, and not unnaturally, consists with bitterness of temper, uncharitableness of judgment, and godlessness of living. This subjective emotion cannot always be distinguished from a merely sensuous feeling, and, with multitudes of persons, especially of the uneducated, is nothing more than that. Sydney Smith was not far out of the way, when he said, that “many a man thinks he is very pious, when, in fact, he is only bilious.”*

A well-drawn portrait of the two types of the religious life, which are the natural outgrowth of the two systems of the Visible and the Invisible Church, would be a useful study. Of course, there is a greater question lying back of all this. It is the great question of the age. It is the question of the Church of God, or mere Humanitarianism, as the Instrumentality for the regeneration of the world. That question we do not touch now. It is Draper and Buckle, &c., &c., on the one hand, and the Gospel of Christ on the other. But we are to speak of the subject, now, in some of its accidents ; for we take for granted,

* See a sensible book, “Influence of Health and Disease on Religious Experience,” by Rev. Dr. J. H. Jones. Phil.: 1865.

that these gentlemen really believe in a Church of some sort, as a reality, and not a sham, a dream of their own conceit. And we say, that there are two types of character produced by the two theories or Systems of the Visible and the Invisible Church. These types are distinctly and strongly marked. Go into the Trumbull Gallery of Yale College, and look at the portrait of Bishop Berkeley, and at that of President Stiles ; and you have the whole thing before you at a glance. There they are, Churchman and Puritan, side by side. In the one, you see the fully developed Christian man, with a loftiness of soul, a heavenly benignity of expression, a countenance beaming with love and good-will, an intellect trained to the keenest exercise of dialectic skill, a heart adorned with the highest culture of the liberal Arts. In the other, the hard sharp features, the stern brow, the deep lines of severe thought, which has brooded over Divine Sovereignty, and Total Depravity, and Limited Atonement, and Unconditional Election and Reprobation, until it fairly delights in visions of wrath, and in God only as a God of awful Justice, and turns from the graces, and elegances, and beauties of Nature and Art, as abnormal, and out of place,—all this, as the natural outgrowth and expression of a distinct system, you see looking down upon you from that speaking portrait. There is power in it, of a certain kind ; and heroism, such as martyrs are made of. But it is not man as he was made, in the image of his Maker, nor as he was designed to be, redeemed, restored, by the Gospel of Christ.

There is one feature in the type of the religious life which this Invisible Church theory produces, which we will not wholly overlook ; and yet we shall only advert to it. It is, to the advocates of that theory, the strong point of the system. If we were to characterize it by its most marked feature, we should call it a cold Intellectualism. It regards Christianity as a *mere* system of Doctrine. It takes for granted, that the Holy Ghost is given, and Grace promised, *only* in connection with the Truth, as addressed to the Intellect. Hence, it relies on reading the Bible, and on Preaching, as the great, we might almost say, the only Means of Grace. It disparages, sometimes con-

terns Sacraments. The result, is, that characteristic which we have styled a cold Intellectualism.

Such a system is false in its premises. It is not true, that Grace is promised only in connection with what addresses the Intellect. God can give Grace, and He has promised Grace, in connection with outward forms. He *can* operate directly and immediately upon the heart, without the intervention of any means whatever, if He pleases. Besides, the Intellect is not the only faculty by which the heart may be reached ; nor is the printed page the only form of language. It is but an artificial sign, at best. Truths, and great truths, can be taught, and most impressively taught, by other signs.

Besides all this, a Christianity which is addressed only to the Intellect, does not reach man's whole nature ; and such a religion will be, at best, one-sided, and the character will lack symmetry and proportion. It may be very rationalistic, but it is as cold as an iceberg: The imagination, the fancy, the taste, the finer sentiments, much of that which constitutes the warmth and tone, the beauty and loveliness of our inner nature, is untouched, undeveloped, unsanctified.

There is still another defect in this system of Intellectualism. It ministers to pride,—pride of Reason. There is a deep meaning in Sacraments, in this regard. That proud haughty man may be willing to *reason* about Christianity, if you will address him as you would a Plato or a Bacon. But tell him to go and bow down, soul and body, like a little child, at the Altar, and receive the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, and see if there is not a language, a meaning in the Sacrament, more potent than the printed page. Tell him that Christ ordained that Sacrament. You arouse at once that stubborn self-will, the worst element in man's spiritual nature, the last enemy to be overcome and vanquished.

We only name this feature of the Invisible Church theory ; and must drop a topic so suggestive and full of meaning. Neither do we undervalue Preaching, and reading the Scriptures. God forbid. But when we talk about the Gospel, and Christianity, let us receive it, as God revealed it ; and not dare try to separate what God hath joined together ; nor disparage

Sacraments and Forms, as having no place in an "Evangelical" system. A Church *with* Sacraments, in all their full reality, is the Evangelical Church; and so it is proving, as clear as the day. Sacraments may be abused and perverted, as well as the printed page; they have their own true place.

There is another feature in this type of the religious life, which it has in common with the System in the opposite extreme. An excessive, monstrous, perverted Visibleism, we see in Romanism. An excessive Invisibleism we see all about us. Yet both these Systems make their appeal to mere feeling; and, though by different methods, often excite that feeling to the highest pitch of intensity, while yet no impression, or almost no impression, is made upon the conscience, the affections, the real character of the individual. As the public courtezans of Rome are among the most "religious" devotees of the one System, so, under the opposite System, the extremest degree of emotionalism is not unoften seen allied to utter shamelessness of private life. It is so now, and has always been so. Old Zachary Grey, in exposing the untruthfulness of Neal's *History of the Puritans*, which he does most thoroughly, and with scathing and well-deserved severity, has the following:—

"So many crimes were those hypocritical cut-throats guilty of, that the cavalier soldiers are not to be brought in comparison with them in any other way, than that of Peggy and the three Sisters, in the Fable. (L'Estrange's Fables, Vol. II., Fab. 87, p. 86.) 'Peggy was such a precedent for sanctity, that her mother would be twitting the other three every day with their sister Peggy. Now this same sister Peggy of theirs, was a notable revelation girl, and never without Heaven and heavenly things in the mouth of her, though they never came near her heart; a Friday-face for every day in the week, a 'Short-hand Book' still at her girdle, and a 'Crums of Comfort' at her bed's-head. The very thoughts of a play-house, or a dancing-bout, would put her into fits. She dreaded the inside of a Popish Chapel, more than all the woes of the Gospel; and her closet devotions were heard further than a Proclamation. As for the other sisters, they lived civilly and socially all this while, in the innocent enjoyment of the lawful comforts of life; but without the least color of scandal, or offense to conscience, honor, or good manners. But this did not hinder the mother with hitting the girls in the teeth with these honest liberties; yes, yes, she'd cry, you are like to be hopeful birds; when will you renounce the world, I wonder, as your sister Peggy has done? Oh, never fear us, good madam, cried the wenches; but by that time we know as

much of the world as sister Peggy, we shall think every jot as ill on't as she does.' Now, poor Peggy had had already two bastards," &c.*

There is, in this type of piety, another tendency, which in this connection deserves to be noticed. They who hold to the Invisible Church theory, seem constantly prone to severity towards those who walk according to another rule. "Knows nothing about vital piety," "mere formalists," are the common-place judgments; pronounced, too, with oracular emphasis. Even that saintly man, good old Bishop White, was publicly prayed for, as "never having met with a change of heart;" and so was Bishop Brownell. Now, in the face of these slanderous imputations, uttered quite too often in these days, upon the practical workings of that System of the Christian Life and growth, which we believe Christ established in His Church, we say, deliberately, and distinctly, with a full understanding of what our language implies, that they who pronounce such judgments, can very well afford to be exceedingly modest and charitable. This branding with reproachful epithets, this calling of hard names, this pharisaical assumption,—it is quite time that all this was at an end. It can be shamed into silence, if need be. It is enough now to say; test the two Systems, not by their pretensions, but by their practical fruits. See in which there is most of the reality, and depth, and power, and meekness, and beauty, of the Life of Christ. See in which there is the noblest, loveliest, completest, transformation and elevation of the whole human character, in all its fair proportions.

We have said, that the theory of the Visible Church is the only one on which the Church can ever be built up. The considerations already urged are enough to show why this must be so. But test this matter practically. Take the case of those American Dioceses where the Church has been most successful, where she has become, and is becoming, a power in the land; and those, where she has proved almost a failure and reproach. Look at Connecticut. The Church there, in all her early history, was oppressed in every way. The Standing

* *Grey's Impartial Examination of Neal*, Vol. IV. p. 44.

Order had every facility of influence and power, political, educational and social, and used it without measure. Yet the Church, to-day, is, relatively, stronger in Connecticut, than in any other Diocese in the country.

Look at Western New York, and compare it with the growth of the Church in Ohio. Both are Western Dioceses. Both were largely settled by a people of similar origin, pursuits, and prejudices. Both are filling up rapidly with an enterprising, thrifty population. How has it been with the Church in these two Dioceses? In a previous Number of this Review, we gave a glance at Ohio; but in respect to the power and mission of the Church in that field, the half was not told.* In Western New York, the whole region was literally burned over by the emotionalism of the Invisible Church System, which seemed, for the time being, to carry everything before it. And yet, although in population, and the number of square miles, it is only about one half the size of Ohio, it has, to-day, a band of 149 canonically resident Clergy, 167 Parishes, and over 14,000 communicants; while a future seems just opening to this young Diocese, of almost unparalleled prosperity.

Look at Wisconsin. Thirty Years ago, there was, in that whole field, one solitary Missionary, to the white population. Now, we behold a Diocese, with its sixty Clergymen, its nearly

* As one specimen of the mode of doing Church work in Ohio, and its results, we give the following statement of a gentleman who is acquainted with nearly every portion of the State. Writing of a certain town, he thus proceeds:—"This village possessed but one Church, (consecrated either by Bishop Chase or Bishop McIlvaine,) to which all, or nearly all the inhabitants of the place, which was settled by Church families, used to attend. But, (the Senior Warden told me,) Bishop McIlvaine had given his consent to the Church being used by both Methodist and Baptist preachers; and the parish had been so neglected by its lawful Shepherds, that, at the time of my visit, there were but a few middle-aged and old people in the place who called themselves Episcopalians; and the Methodists had so increased, that the rising generation was either of that persuasion, or none; and they had proceeded so far as to claim the Church property. Sometime previous to my visit, a class had been preparing for Confirmation; and a few weeks before the time appointed for the Bishop's visitation, there came into Church, about the close of the non-resident Rector's Sermon, a Methodist preacher, who, as soon as the Sermon was ended, and before the Hymn had been given out, without previous consultation with the Rector, announced that a "Protracted Meeting" would be commenced in the Church on the following evening. The "Protracted Meeting" was held, and resulted in a "Revival;" which, I believe, rendered the Bishop's visitation unnecessary, so far as administering the Rite of Confirmation was concerned."

This, of course, is just such sort of Churchmanship as the Sects like. There is no "Puseyism" about this!

eighty parishes, its thousands of communicants, (3373,) and its noble College, and Schools, and Theological Seminary.

Look at Minnesota, one of the youngest of all our Dioceses, only eight years old ; yet putting forth strength and vigor, disarming opposition, and conquering confidence by the power of love and faith.

What is the secret of this growth, in these hard fields ? There is only one answer. The Church has gone forth to do her own work, in her own way. She has been presented, not as a Sect among Sects ; not as a mere idea, a metaphysical abstraction, an impalpable nonentity. She has been exhibited by earnest, true-hearted, self-denying men, in her primitive purity and beauty, as a living, positive, visible reality ; as the very Mystical Body of Christ. The body and soul of Religion have not been severed. The Invisible Church may, possibly, do for angels ; we do not know ; it will never do for men.

In our criticisms upon Dr. Vinton's theory of Church Unity, we are not defining, nor attempting to define, the nature of the Visible Unity of the Church ; or showing what are the true Notes of that Unity. But we repeat, here, what can never be too often nor too strongly urged, in such a day as this, that the only true, the only possible basis of restored Unity is, *the Church, as it was planted by Apostolic and Inspired men, and under their immediate guidance.* This was the work to which they were specially called and sent. For this, the HOLY GHOST was specially promised, and given to them. (Acts i. 1-8. John xiv. 26.) They knew the mind and will of Christ, as to the establishment of His Church. They acted upon that knowledge. The Church, as thus planted, must be of divine obligation. Our witness to that Church is the Ante-Nicene Church, as it was in Faith, Ministry, and Worship ; when, providentially, persecution kept the Church pure. We admit, too, that there is a sense, and a most important sense, in which Church Unity consists with a certain degree of diversity. Since the days of Augustine, men have differed in the interpretation of Doctrine ; and minds and hearts always have craved and always will crave more or less of external Form in Worship. In Essentials, there must be unity ; in Non-essentials, liberty ;

in all things, charity. There can be no true Catholicity, and no true Catholic Unity, without this. It is not a liberty which shall violate either Faith or Order, or which shall teach in any form the heresies of either Rome or Geneva.

We admit, too, that in the practical work of the Church, that spontaneity and earnestness of individual life which shall call forth all the resources of the Church, and enable her to address herself to the spiritual wants of all "sorts and conditions of men," will never be developed, until we shall have unlearned some great errors, and learned some great lessons. The Church has already begun both to unlearn and to learn. Rome understands this matter of adaptation better, far, than we. True conservatism is not an iron rigidity in accidents; and it is not stagnation and death. And we regret that when, at the last General Convention, the heart of the Church called for a new Prayer for "more laborers,"—now our greatest want, if they be laborers indeed,—and when there was a strong desire expressed for the *orderly* coöperation of faithful laymen, Catechists and Readers, as it was in the early Church,* and so to reach the sympathies and wants of thousands and hundreds of thousands never found now in our cushioned Churches, both these measures were lost in the House of Bishops.

Here we might leave this whole question of Dr. Vinton's theory of Visible Unity. But we were to show, that that theory is not only un-Scriptural and false, but that it is also mischievous. He says, that "a moral, spiritual, internal, vital, *but not organic* Unity, was all that was intended by our Lord, and that was precisely such a Unity as already exists." Let us look at this matter a little more closely. We give the following list of Religious Sects in this country. Calvinistic Baptists. Free-Will Baptists. Free-Communion Baptists. Close-Communion Baptists. Hard-shell Baptists. Soft-Shell Baptists. Church-of-God Baptists. Ironsides Baptists. Little-Children Baptists. Glory-Alleuia Baptists. Seventh-Day Baptists. Six-Principle Baptists. Emancipation Baptists. Unitarian Baptists. Campbellite Baptists. Particular Baptists. Episcopal Methodists. Protestant Methodists. Prim-

* Bingham's Antiquities, B. iii. Ch. 10.

itive Methodists. Independent Methodists. Welsh Methodists Calvinistic. Wesleyan Methodists. Wesleyan Methodist Church of the Pilgrims. Congregational Methodists. Associate Methodists. Old-School Presbyterians. New-School Presbyterians. Cumberland Presbyterians. Associate Presbyterians. Dutch Reformed Presbyterians. Reformed Presbyterians. United Presbyterians. German Presbyterians. True-Reformed Dutch. United Brethren. Orthodox Congregationalists. Unitarian Congregationalists. Transcendental Congregationalists. Universalist Congregationalists. Romanists. Moravians. Second Adventists. New Jerusalemites. Christians. Primitive Christians. Christian Unionists. Friends. Hicksites. Shakers. Sandemanians. Daleites. Come-Outers. Millenarians. Millerites. Mormonites. Swedenborgians. Bereans. Tunkers. Reformed Tunkers. Wilkinsonsians. Christian Israelites. Wilburites. Gurneyites. Apostolic Church. Spiritualists. Disciples. True Believers. Fransites. Mennonites. Winnebrennarians. Rappists.

Here is a list of over *seventy* Religious Sects in this country ; and it is incomplete, and is constantly increasing. Let us see how Dr. Vinton's theory works, as a practical matter, in such a field. One of our Missionaries at the West, in a town containing about *five thousand* inhabitants, thus writes :—

“The Presbyterians and Methodists have each large and flourishing congregations, and comfortable houses of worship in the place. The Baptists have begun to build a church, which they design to be the finest and costliest, requiring, to complete it, from twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars ; while the Congregationalists, with a variety of other sects, such as the Protestant Methodist, German Methodist, German Baptists, Evangelicals, French Presbyterians, Lutherans, Romanists, Unitarians, Universalists, Spiritualists, all have either churches and organized congregations, or are largely and often loudly represented in the religious population. In this respect our town is Western. All creeds, sects, ideas, theories, prejudices, whims, infidelities, superstitions, and fanaticisms under the sun, have here their advocates.”

Here we have *fifteen* different denominations in a single town, with an average population to each of a little over *three hundred*. Is this such Unity as the blessed Saviour prayed for, that “they all may be One, that the world may believe that

Thou hast sent Me?" Such an exhibition of struggling, jarring, warring Sects, may be seen all over the country. A gentleman just from the extreme verge of civilization at the West, hands us a list of *twelve* of these Sects, planning and plotting for a foothold in his own frontier town. Is it a wonder that Infidelity increases? Even in Western New York, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Coxe, not long since, in a missionary speech, described the utter exhaustion which this miserable system has finally reached. Whole communities, as such, without any form of Religion! Houses of Worship closed! the mass of the people living, and their children growing up, without anything which can be called the public Means of Grace! We put it to Dr. Vinton, is there anything radically and organically wrong in all this? Not if his theory of Unity is the true theory. And yet, here we see the natural workings of a mischievous principle, which is filling the land, first, with indifference to all Religion; then, with practical heathenism; and then, with open, scoffing Infidelity; and yet, Dr. Vinton says, "the Unity which we already enjoy, is the only Unity contemplated in the Bible."

In all this, we have proof of the utter nonsense and absurdity of Dr. Vinton's illustration of Unity, before alluded to. It is not an illustration of Church Unity at all; but rather of a complete Bedlam of incongruous, disintegrating elements, between which there is and can be no affinity. He says, "Life is one principle." Yet both lambs and wolves partake of it. Therefore, according to Dr. Vinton's theory, lambs and wolves properly belong to one and the same fold. So, too, in all the existing, warring Sects of the day, there is "life" of a certain sort; and we may wisely leave to God, and to the workings of His Providence, to indicate the true nature of that life. But, according to the *principle* of Dr. Vinton,—and it is by principle that we are to be guided,—instead of the fruitful branches and the fruitless branches, the good grapes and the sour grapes, on the same organic vine, we may have, rather, briars and brambles; on which, by the very law of their nature, no grapes can ever grow; but only thorns, whose end is to be burned. Whether even organic vegetable life "is one principle," or not, may be

questioned ; it depends wholly on the definition of terms ; yet, assuredly, true Spiritual, Supernatural Life, is to be practically sought by us, only according to that Organic Law which Christ Himself ordained.

We have said that Schism is not only a Sin, but that it is full of mischievous Evils. Some of those Evils have already been alluded to. Let us specify them a little more particularly.

Schism exhausts resources which the Church needs for her outward, aggressive, Missionary work. As we have already seen, in village after village, scattered over the older and the newer sections of our country, instead of all professing believers in Christ meeting in one temple for His praise and worship, bowing at one common Altar as brethren, and uniting to sustain the Gospel at home, and then to send it abroad,—they are divided and subdivided, again and again, into four, five, six, seven, and even a dozen lean and quarreling Sects. Thus, millions on millions of money are wasted annually, in keeping up these separate and hostile organizations. Thousands on thousands of men who might go to heathen lands, are kept at home, the leaders of rival Sects, which must always remain feeble ; or, more likely, under this disintegrating process, ultimately die out. Schism is their sin ; and Schism is their punishment.*

Schism breeds unholy tempers and passions. It would be a humiliating task to trace the history of Sectarian bitterness, for the last thousand years. It has slain its thousands and hundreds of thousands, amid the horrors of the battle-field. It has plunged countless numbers into dungeons, to die alone, with none to close the eye of death. It has invented that masterpiece of Satan's malignity, the Romish Inquisition. It

* A modern writer says:—"Out of nearly *one hundred* Sects, which were flourishing in the days of Charles I., and whose names are recorded on the page of history, but two or three are now in existence ; and these so altered, that they could not at present be recognized by their own founders." Thomas Edwards' *Gangraena*, Part II. Edwards states that there were "eleven different Religions in one Parish in London ;" and he mentions one family of four persons, each of whom "professed a distinct form of belief" Salmasius, the Presbyterian, says, (A. D. 1660,) "more than *one hundred and fifty* monstrous and unheard of Sects are at this hour raging in England." *Ad Joannem Miltonum Resp.* p. 42.

has erected the gallows, kindled the fires, and raised the axe, for the martyrdom of myriads. It has enacted blood-thirsty laws of religious proscription. And then, in these modern times, when the rough edge of intolerance has been smoothed down by sheer necessity, it has still gone, with the same spirit, into the retirement of social and private life, to stir up unholy passions, to emit the poisonous breath of slander ; to look with green-eyed jealousy upon the pious acts of those who have presumed to differ in Religion. It has seized the pen and the press to make Science and Art contribute their aid, in the unholy work of inflicting insult and injury upon those who claim to be children of God and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. To elucidate fairly the evils under this head, would require volumes. The picture, to be perfect, should be painted in blood.

Schism gives to Jews, Infidels, and Heathens, a strong argument against Christianity. The divisions of the Church, and the worldliness of the Church, are the one grand hindrance to the conversion of the world. Suppose that an intelligent Jew resolves to enter seriously upon an examination of the Christian Religion. He sympathizes with no religious Sect. He is willing candidly to examine the claims of all. Year after year is before him, before he can thoroughly master the standard works which these Denominations pile up before him. And between the wide extreme of Romanism, with its ponderous tomes on the one hand, and the very latest theoretical development of Transcendentalism on the other, and the numerous grades and schools of philosophy, old and new, which fill up the intervening distance, all which the Jew is told must be thoroughly weighed,—who will be responsible for the life of the poor Jew, while he is thus seeking for the pearl of great price ? or who will say that he shall be able to grasp, even if found, the truth to be evolved in all these systems ? This is not an imaginary objection. It is really one of the very strongest arguments against Christianity, felt and urged by the Jew at the present day. It points the keenest dart of the Infidel, and gives the finishing touch to the airy bubble which he blows up against the Religion of the Nazarene. It is not without

some show of reason, that the shrewd Brahmin addresses Missionaries, as they appear before him, each with their own system of Religion,—“First go home and settle among yourselves what Christianity is, and then come and teach us.”

These are some of the natural, inevitable, terrible results of that theory of Church Unity, which Dr. Vinton apologizes for and justifies. Indeed, on his theory, there is, and can be, no such thing as Schism. And yet, since the days of the old Greek Philosophy, when St. Paul preached Christ in the Areopagus of Athens, there has never been a period, never a country, which so imperiously demanded a positive Christianity, as our own.

Let us cherish in our hearts the doctrine of the Unity of the Church. Let us labor for it, and pray for it. Let us never cease to protest against a principle, which, if it were suffered to prevail, would divide and subdivide the army of the living God, until its strength was gone; which would present a spectacle to Angels and men, over which the Saviour might weep, and wicked men and Devils alone exult; where the Saviour's garment, seamless in itself, would hang only in tattered shreds; where his One Body should be torn, until one heart could no longer beat through its scattered members, and one system of nerves and sinews, all flowing from one common centre, could no longer control its operations. The Church's Unity will yet be realized. Our blessed SAVIOUR's prayer will yet be answered.

As this question of Visible Unity with the Sects is now before the Church, as a practical thing, we will not leave the matter here. There are one or two movements of our times, to which, in conclusion, let us give our attention. The “American Christian Commission,” so-called, a new Society lately assembled at Cleveland, Ohio, subsequently perfected its organization in the City of New York. It was reported, in a Presbyterian newspaper, (*The American Presbyterian*,) as representing “twenty-one different Evangelical Denominations!” from as many different States, and numbering three hundred delegates. A little examination of the various elements of this new Union, this representation of “twenty-one different Evangelical Denominations,” and of its debates and

doings, would be somewhat suggestive. Once, a man's Orthodoxy was supposed to depend on his Creed, on what he believed. Unbelief was called Infidelity. It was regarded as one of the greatest sins against God. Men simply took Christ at His word. They believed that "the wrath of God abideth on him" "that believeth not the Son." They saw no way in which there *can* be, either right feeling, or right acting, except from right believing. They would have pronounced an attempt to make such a distinction, as an utter absurdity, as involving a moral contradiction, as sheer doctrinal quackery, and as full proof of indifference to and corruption of the Faith.

Now, according to this old-fashioned rule, some of the men who figured prominently at this "Commission" at Cleveland, have a very queer record on the matter of Christian Doctrine. To say nothing of the Pelagianism and Socinianism represented at Cleveland, one of these "twenty-one different Evangelical Denominations" was the Sect called Christians, who have rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, and refuse to be bound by any Creed.* It was from this Sect, it appears, "who have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost,"—or if they have heard it, do not believe it,—that the proposition came, to strike out the word "Evangelical," from the title of this new Society; and after a long and warm debate, they proved strong enough to carry the point. We remember, however, that an Andover Professor, who has the theological training of a great many of the preachers of one of the most numerous and busy of these Sects, has found out a way to swear most solemnly, every year, that he believes, and promises to teach, the Assembly's Catechism, and so, to pocket his salary; and yet, a prominent Trustee of that Seminary, (Rev. Dr. Dana,) has published to the world, that that same Professor "has repeatedly stamped the most important of those Articles with ridicule, and exposed them to public scorn." We remember, too, that some of these very Sects which met at Cleveland, have, within the last few months, been literally torn to pieces by internal convulsions, and have been indulging themselves in the not

* Dr. Baird's Religion in America, p. 563.

very harmless or edifying business of calling each other very bad names, and refusing to have anything to do with each other. Really, the prospect, to us Churchmen, of Union with such elements of strife and discord, does not seem particularly alluring. This, however, is not the point now before us.

At this Meeting of the "Commission," at Cleveland, the leading minds among those "twenty-one different Evangelical Denominations," evinced alarm at the constantly increasing weakness of the Sects, and their failure to meet the great spiritual issues of our age and times; and, at the same time, at the rapidly growing strength of Romanism in this country.

The facts then and there cited, prove clearly enough, that they have abundant cause for such alarm, on both these grounds. But in all their discussions, and in their plans for the future, they did not once touch the real evil to be remedied. They see, and feel, now, the absolute necessity of organic Union; but they are trying to build a great house on the sand, and without a foundation. They not only ignore the Church, but they ignore the Faith of Christ. Rome laughs at their fright; and well she may; for she knows, much better than they, what it means, and where it will end. It is noticeable, also, that while Rome and these Sects hate each other unfeignedly, yet she stands ready, to-day, as she has always stood, to join them, heart and hand, in destroying, if possible, that Branch of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of God, which differs radically from both these opposite Systems; and which PROTESTS, alike, against the additions of the one, and the negations of the other. Rome would hold a grand Jubilee in every one of her Churches and Cathedrals throughout the world, if she could only see our Branch of the Church sacrifice her principles, and merge herself in, and be swallowed up by, the disintegrating, crumbling Sects of the day. For she knows, as well as we, that the Church is the only body in this country, which can prevent her from ultimately controlling its spiritual destinies.

As we are dealing now with facts, we will state another. We are informed, on the authority of a gentleman whose position gives him a better opportunity of knowing the secret policy

of public bodies than any other man in the country, that the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country is to be met with a combined opposition, within the next few months, and perhaps years, such as she has never contended against before. We have had an inkling of this same thing from other sources. We do not care to state now all that we know of the agents of that opposition, or the measures, direct and indirect, which are to be employed. But we may say, that some of the most openly avowed opposers of the distinctive principles of the Church were specially active at the late Meeting at Cleveland, and the movements of this new organization are worthy of some attention. If, indeed, its object is, really, the spiritual interests of the country and the salvation of souls, for which there were abundant agencies before, it shall have nothing from us but good wishes, even while we doubt the wisdom of its plans. If, however, it has another object in view,—if it is to prove the counterpart of the great Sectarian Convention or League of 1766–1775,—it shall not be our fault if it does not gain all the notoriety it can desire.*

At and by this Convention, just named, whose Sessions were held regularly for many years, and down to the commencement of the Revolutionary War, and whose doings have since been printed, for private distribution only, the leading Sects of the country, in all the Northern and Middle States, were banded together for an organized opposition to the admission of Episcopacy into this country. They plotted and planned. They established a Committee in London to watch the British Government. They openly threatened that government with Civil War and Revolution, if Episcopacy were sent,—though the Episcopacy asked for by Churchmen was simply and only for the performance of those spiritual functions which are binding on the consciences of Episcopalians. The prime Minister cowered before their threats; and was as treacherous to the Church, as the licentious, unprincipled Walpole had been before him; and yet, on the part of Walpole, his treachery involved an infamous breach of faith, not only with the Church, but with his own most solemn pledge to such a man as Dean

* See Am. Quar. Church Review, Vol. IV., pp. 548–579.

Berkeley. Oh ! for a historian of those times, who shall dare tell the truth, like an honest man, and expose the trickeries wherewith the Church was wounded in the house of her friends. Our readers know at what sacrifices, at last, the lion-hearted Seabury, who had been thrown into prison by these intolerant, persecuting bigots in 1775, obtained a Primitive Apostolic Episcopacy for the American Church. They know with what reception he was met by that same party on his return. They will remember, too, the literary and historical frauds and hypocrisies with which the same party lampooned the Church in the days of Hobart,—conduct at which Liguori would have blushed, especially if he was found out. Dr. Lyman Beecher, in his Auto-biography, alludes, again and again, to this war upon Episcopacy. All this was in 1819. There is a rich chapter here of Church history, which has never yet been written.

And now, we ask, have the leaders of this same party, in our day, lost one single jot or tittle of this bitter hate of Episcopacy ? The old "Solemn League and Covenant," which the Puritan Civil and Ecclesiastical authorities of England put forth in 1643, and which the Parliament required to be taken by all persons in the kingdom above the age of eighteen years, ran as follows :—

"That we shall, in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavor the EXTIRPATION of Popery, PRELACY, (that is Church government by Archbishops, Bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy,) superstition, Heresy, Schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues."*

This was Puritan "Freedom of Conscience," which we hear so much of. Has that same old bitter spirit abated in the slightest degree ? Do these men love Episcopacy now any better than they did then ? That is the question for us Churchmen. We confess, we have never seen the slightest indication of it. Most certainly, recent events do not look very much like it. They are merely playing a different game,—

* Clarendon's History, Vol. I., p 530. Hetherington's Assembly of Divines, p. 111. Grant's English Church and Sects, Vol. II. Chap. xi.

blarney and flatteries, instead of persecutions and dungeons,—that is all. The faces on the stage are new ; the costumes are new ; the orchestra is new ; the music is new ; but it is the same identical old Play, and the characters are unchanged ; dukes, dupes, jesters, and all. The same old bitter intolerance, the same grasping love of power, is as rampant as ever. Bishop Potter's Pastoral Letter, which was issued merely to protect the integrity of Episcopal Orders within our own Fold,—that was its only object,—“*must be put where it belongs, under the heel.*”

Why this unceasing warfare is waged against the Church, is a question which we do not now raise. It has its cause, undoubtedly, and its lessons. But, if Churchmen choose to believe, that Jesus Christ, through His Inspired Apostles, established a three-fold Ministry,—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,—for His Church, and promised to be with that Ministry until the end of time ; if they choose to claim to have that Ministry, and to be able to prove that claim, by an argument which never has been answered ; they certainly have a right to that belief, and to that claim ; and they will, undoubtedly, exercise it. With such a belief, it is not only their right, it is their bounden duty, to maintain the integrity of that Ministry within their own boundaries ; and they will do it effectually ; and without asking permission or making apologies. They would be less than Christian men, not to notice, and to treat as they deserve, these persistent and insidious attacks upon what, with them, is not a mere matter of feeling, or of private opinion, but of conscientious conviction.

As a specimen of these constant assaults upon the Church, and of the measures employed to decoy away her members, we give a few extracts from a late production, sent forth to the world by a Rev. Dr. Vermilye, a Dutch Reformed Minister of this City. He it was, who was for putting Bishop Potter's Pastoral “*under the heel!*” That is it ; the “*Extirpation*” again of Episcopacy ; the “root and branch” men, once more upon the stage, shorn of their power, not of the disposition. This Dr. Vermilye is also one of those most active in getting up the “Christian Unity” movement, so-called ; into which a few of our own Clergy have been drawn. If we were to char-

acterize this latest effusion of Dr. Vermilye's pen, we should say, it is a piece of mosaic, cunningly put together, of phariseism, ignorance, misrepresentation, impertinence, bitterness, intolerance, and threatening. The following are specimens:—

"The logical sequence of the central High Church dogma, in its final step, is mere Popery. * * * Of the three parties into which the Reformation seemed to divide the English Church, only one fairly adopted the Reformation principle. *The middle party, never half reformed, has usually had control in England, as the corresponding party has here. And the result has been Puseyism, which was disguised Popery.* * * * The true work of Protestant Christianity is to spread the pure doctrine of the New Testament; and this as much through corrupt churches as among heathen. But this can never be done by forgetting our own Reformation birthright, and flattering and looking kindly upon the corruptions that made that Reformation necessary. * * * All falsehood and wrong must cease, and it will cease only by conflict. In the civil state, we have just emerged from war, which we hope and believe has forever overthrown one form of civil wrong, human slavery. * * * But the church is to experience a shaking also. And we think the conflict must be, between this ceremonial principle, with all its offshoots and sequences, and the simple doctrines of grace. *We think we can identify the separate armies; and, perhaps, even now, the note of preparation has sounded and the gathering is silently begun. Each will go according to his affinities; and each should now inquire where he properly belongs, and report himself there. Much responsibility, in this present case, and in truth in regard to the whole subject, rests upon our Low Church, Episcopal brethren. We believe they will feel and meet their responsibilities. Whether they are where they ought to be,—whether in existing emergencies, they have yet come up fairly to the positions logic and consistency as well as their high evangelism require them to occupy, they are best able to judge.*"

All this is sufficiently significant. As another illustration of the temper exhibited in that denomination toward the Church,—in the Weekly newspaper which is the organ of these Dutch Presbyterians, there appeared, a little while ago, an Article against the Church, which was not only so bitter, but so full of imputations of a personal character, that the paper was compelled to retract every word, and to confess that the charges were without the shadow of a foundation. The retraction, however, was made in a manner only to add insult to injury. These charges were occasioned by some accessions from that denomination to the Church; and the smarting of mortifica-

tion sought to vent itself in this way. Here, indeed, is evidently the whole trouble. Ever since the old Dutch Presbyterians lost control of New Amsterdam, two hundred years ago, they seem never to have forgotten the old grudge, which Washington Irving described with such inimitable humor. Nor does it seem to heal the wound, that with all their rich endowments of money, the denomination scarcely holds its own; and that so many of its members are all the while finding a more congenial home in the bosom of the Church. Large numbers of our noblest and most earnest Churchmen are of such an origin. If Dr. Velmilye will accept a little advice, we would suggest, that if he wishes to build up Dutch Presbyterianism in this city, and to save the souls of men in that way, why not go out into the alleys of the city, where Dutch Protestants, constantly landing upon our shores, are living in utter destitution, and are fast sinking into practical heathenism. There, almost at his very door, he may see a missionary field worthy of all his efforts. If, however, his zeal is to seek more satisfactory expression in defaming and assailing the Church, we assure him, that both the experience and instincts of Churchmen will be quite sure to estimate him and his labors at their full value; and that he mistakes, greatly, if he puts a wrong construction upon the silence of Christian gentlemen, and upon their refusal to render railing for railing. So he will find in the end.

Meanwhile, practically, the Church has no new lessons to learn; save that of renewed loyalty to her great Head, and unshrinking fidelity to the trust committed to her. All that she has to do is, to work and pray, and, if need be, to suffer, in faith. Her principles will be tested to the uttermost, and her standard bearers will be tried as by fire. Not unlikely, there will be defections from the Church. Ten years ago, there was a tendency among us toward Rome; and between the years 1845 and 1855, amid the jeers and taunts of the Church's enemies, *twenty-seven* of our Clergy went over to the Roman Schism. Just now, there is, unquestionably, a tendency in the opposite direction; and the Sects see it, and are trying to strengthen and use it. Uneasy spirits among us are seeking

every opportunity to show where their real sympathies and affinities are. It certainly would not be surprising, that men who are Churchmen from mere preference, or expediency, and not from principle ; men who have learned their Theology at the feet of other masters ; men, puffed up with self-conceit ; men, veering with every current of popular opinion ; men, whose imprudences and unfaithfulness have bred distrust and loss of confidence ; men, whose self-will chafes under the sober, healthful restraints of the Church, and is fully determined no longer to brook them ; men, who, incited by the Church's enemies, have pledged themselves to trample upon Church Law and Order, and dare the consequences,—we say, it would not be strange if such men should, sooner or later, go to their own place. Should it prove so, the Church will survive their departure. If, ten years ago, under the power of her organic law of life and growth, she was stronger than ever, when Romanism had sloughed off, she will not suffer now from being rid of an element which only weakens her influence. The Church has no real sympathy with either Rome or Geneva, as such. She will do her own work, in her own way. If she is indeed founded on the Rock CHRIST JESUS, they that be for her, are more than they that be against her.

In these pages, it has been our object to note, with some minuteness, those loose Church views which characterize our age and times ; to show that they are false in theory, and mischievous in tendency ; and to exhibit the spirit of determined hostility which this radicalism is manifesting toward what we believe to be the Church of God. With such teaching and such a temper, there can be no compromise. We will not purchase peace of such a foe at the price of treachery, and the surrender of the Truth of God. The irregularities which called forth the Pastoral Letter of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Potter, were but symptoms of a disease deeply seated, wide-spreading, insidious, and malignant. Firmness for principle at every sacrifice, and, at the same time, a spirit of charity, forgiveness, and forbearance towards individuals,—this is now the bounden duty of Churchmen.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE DIRECTORIUM ANGLICANUM; being a Manual of Directions for the right Celebration of the Holy Communion, for the saying of Matins and Evensong, and for the Performance of other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Ancient Use of the Church of England. With plan of Chancel, and Illustrations of "such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their Ministration, (as) shall be retained, and be in use as were in this Church of England, by the Authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth." Second Edition, Revised. Edited by the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D. C. L., F. S. A., Lond. and Scot.; Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Earl of Morton, &c., &c. (London: Thomas Bosworth. 4to., pp. xlvii, 306, and fifteen 4to. plates.)

We give this title in full, yet it conveys an imperfect impression of the volume itself. The first edition was published in 1848, and the new edition is called for by the ultra Ritualists who seem bent on restoring, to the Reformed Church of England, some of the most offensive of the Mediæval ceremonies of Romanism, which were still retained in the second year of Edward VI. The Frontispiece of the volume, or Plan of the Chancel at the administration of the Holy Communion, is a gorgeous picture, and would never remind one of a Reformed Catholic Church. The lights burning on the Altar, the Crucifix, the Priest in the act of elevating the Host, the variegated and richly embroidered vestments, &c., &c., represent a scenic display admirably calculated to impress the senses. At the end of the volume, are sixteen lithographed quarto plates containing representations of vestments and furniture, from an altar completely equipped down to chalice covers and palls. One would infer that Ceremonialism in the English Church was about to become one of the fine arts; and that, as at Rome, learned men were to devote themselves to stage-effect. The terms, too, used in this *Directorium Anglicanum*, are somewhat peculiar, as describing an English Church Service; such as *Almuce*, *Amyss*, *Aspergillum*, *Aspersorium*, *Gremial*, *Pianeta*, *Benatura*, &c., &c. The following are some of the directions for the officiating Priest, when consecrating the elements.

The reader will note the words which we have placed in italics.

"Let him stand erect, not lounging on the altar; his elbows should touch his sides; when he lifts up his hands, the extremities of his fingers should just be seen above his shoulders. He should join three fingers together, with which he will make the sign of the Cross; the other two he shall lay together in his hand."

"Whilst he shall say, *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes*, he shall fetch a breath, and with one inspiration shall say the words, *Hoc EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM*: so that any other train of thought shall not

intermingle with them. For it seems not reasonable to interrupt a form so short, so important, and so efficacious, whose whole virtue depends on the last word, namely, MEUM, which is said in the person of Christ. In like manner, the same rule should be observed in the consecration of the Blood."

"If he has to consecrate more *hosts* than one, he ought to *elevate* that one of those which he has determined upon with himself from the beginning of the *Mass*; and should hold it in regard to others, so that he may direct his sight and *intention* to all at the same time."

"Before *Mass*, the priest should not wash his mouth or teeth, but only his lips from without, with his mouth closed as he has need, lest perchance he should intermingle the taste of water with his saliva. After *Mass* also, he should beware of expectorations as much as possible, until he shall have eaten and drunken, lest by chance anything should have remained between his teeth or in his *fauces*, which by expectoration he might eject."

Now, it is not surprising that there should be, in the English Church, a strong reaction from the cold repulsive features which the Puritan party sought to fasten upon the Worship of that Church; and we may expect to feel that reaction in this country. Symbolism, outward expression of the hearts truest, deepest sentiments and feelings, we may and shall have. Nature is full of symbolism. Our own Ritual can be, and ought to be, made far more beautiful, and imposing, and impressive, than it is. With the advance of the age in culture, Æstheticism is naturally developing itself everywhere, and in every possible form. We see it in Society on every hand. But, in Religion, a Symbolism of the true Faith, and a Worship which expresses that true Faith, is one thing; a Symbolism of Romish Mediæval Error and Corruption, however dazzling to the senses, is quite another thing; and in developing the one, let us be careful not to ape or be guiled into, the other. All that we can now say, is, that this new Ritualistic movement in England has, to some extent most certainly, its origin in a false Theology. So far from leading to Romish Error, it springs from, and is based upon it, and Error, too, of the most dangerous kind. This point we are fully prepared to prove. Calling itself Catholic, it is a miserable caricature and perversion of Catholicity. Even such men as Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison have come out boldly against it. As yet, in this country, we are not cursed with such fooleries; and we have no obsolete dead and buried Rubrics, behind which such representations can be enacted. Men who want them, must go where the genuine article can be had. Nor will they be the losers, for Romish Ceremonialism when well displayed is a very respectable performance, compared with such imitations as are attempted in the volume before us.

THE VICARIOUS SACRIFICE grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation. By HORACE BUSHNELL, New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. 8vo. pp. 552.

This Horace Bushnell, of whom most of our readers know nothing, is one of the New Lights of modern New England Theology—if any body can tell what that is. He studied his Theology at New Haven, when Taylorism was at its zenith; a system—if it deserves to be called a system—whose founder unfortunately attempted to write Theology without being a theologian, and Metaphysics, without being a metaphysician; and who spent his whole life in promulgating a theory which, a little solid learning would have taught him, was nothing more than an old heresy in a new garb. All these New England System-makers, Edwards, and Emmons, and Hopkins, and Dwight, and Taylor, have made it their life-work to get rid of the terrible incubus of the old Calvinistic Philosophy, to reconcile it in some way, with Scripture and Sound Reason; and so to silence their own doubts, and to check the reaction from that Philosophy into Deism and open Unbelief, which has spread so extensively in all that region. Dr. Bushnell has, for many years, been trying his hand at something new; for Novelty in Theology, instead of being an object of suspicion and distrust in such quarters, is hailed with pleasure as promising relief. Dr. Bushnell's writings have been mostly devoted to the doctrine of the Trinity, in some one or other of its aspects. His "God in Christ," published in 1847, startled and alarmed the more sober-minded Congregationalists; while the boldness of his speculations generally, has done its work in unsettling the minds of younger men who have clustered around him. The Boston Unitarians, meanwhile, have looked complacently upon Dr. Bushnell's writings, as doing their work in such a field far more surely and effectively than they could possibly do it themselves. They apparently understand Dr. Bushnell much better than he understands himself. Besides some reckless statements in matters of Christian doctrine, he has occasionally given utterance to some great truths, or, more strictly, parts of truths, which the old Calvinistic philosophy of necessity ignored or denied.

What we have already said of Dr. Bushnell's antecedents, will prepare us for an examination of this his last work, on that great subject, The Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ. It is just such a work as we should expect from Dr. Bushnell on such a theme. There is not a single new thing in it. The only strong point in the book is the author's attack upon what is termed the *commercial* or *quid pro quo*, Calvinistic theory of the Atonement; a theory which supposes the Atonement to be addressed only to the Justice of God. But in denying this, he has, with Channing and the Unitarian writers generally, given up all true and right conception of Vicarious Sacrifice. That great cardinal truth of Holy Scripture and the Church,—“that thou, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world”—that truth, so fundamental in the Gospel, Dr. Bushnell rejects.

Here is a specimen of his language. "Retributive justice, then, or penal suffering, has nothing to do with the supposed satisfaction. But the satisfaction to God's honor turns wholly, we shall see, on the matter of Christ's obedience—obedience unto death. The conception is, that he comes into the world, not simply to be murdered, or as being commanded by the Father to die, but that, having a specially right work laid upon him by the Father, *he is able rather to die for it than to renounce it.*" That is, His Vicarious Sacrifice was of the very same nature, precisely, as the sacrifice of our heroes of the late war.

Again, he says: "If Christ has simply died to even up a score of penalty, if the total import of his cross is, that God's wrath is satisfied, and the books made square, there is certainly no beauty in that to charm a new feeling into life; on the contrary, there is much to revolt the soul, at least in God's attitude, and even to raise a chilly revulsion." This is almost the very language of Channing in 1815. Dr. Bushnell will reply, there is no argument in saying that. No, there is not. We are not arguing with Dr. Bushnell at all, now. We are merely showing, that he denies the Cross of Christ, and takes his place henceforth in that long catalogue of men who, beguiled by Philosophy, have closed the door of hope to *guilty* man opened by the Gospel.

An equally revolting portion of this work, is Dr. Bushnell's treatment of the subject of Sacrifices, under what we call the old Dispensations. He says, "*if they were instituted by God, it could only be by God acting through the sentiments and wants, and guilty yearnings of men,*" &c., &c. And then, he dares to speak of "the charlatanism of interpretation—it is really one of the saddest chapters of our Christian history," by which faith has, in the ages all along, seen, in that old Sacrifice, "the LAMB slain from the foundation of the world," "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

We have no more space now to give to this volume. It is a sad spectacle to see a man like Dr. Bushnell, in whom there are so many marks of a noble character, throwing himself away, and making utter shipwreck of the Faith. There is another view, of Man, of Sacrifice, of the Cross, of the HOLY GHOST (*of whom Dr. Bushnell seems never to have heard*), which we hope he will live long enough to take; and so to quiet that daring yet uneasy restless spirit which everywhere pervades this volume.

We scarcely need add, that the Church has a great work to do in New England, if she is true to herself. Not elsewhere in all the country is there more truly Missionary ground.

JESUS AND THE COMING GLORY: or Notes on Scripture. By JOEL JONES, LL. D. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton. 1865. 8vo. pp. 584.

For several reasons, this volume, with which we presume most of our readers are wholly unacquainted, deserves special attention. Not that its intrinsic merits are remarkable; yet its author was a schol-

arly man and of very considerable attainments in several departments of learning. As a layman, accustomed by his judicial position and experience to the most careful weighing of evidence, his comments upon what are termed "the difficulties of Scripture," may well be set off against the flippant, superficial, noisy dogmatism of the Tom Paine school, which seems to be reviving among us. His object is, not so much to give a continuous Commentary upon the connected narrative of Holy Scripture, as to trace the great work of Christ from His estate of humiliation to His exaltation, at the Resurrection and Ascension. Taking St. Matthew as a guide up to the time of the Crucifixion, other portions of the Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles, are used, when they will contribute to his purpose. The fragmentary character of the volume is, therefore, apparent rather than real.

The marked feature of the work, however, which characterises all the author's views, is his theory on the Second Advent of Christ, the resurrection of the Elect Church, and the Millenarian period which is then to follow. His Millenarian views are the natural, logical result of the Calvinistic notions in which he was educated, and from which he seems never to have swerved. Ignoring and denying the fact, that the Visible Church, which Christ through his inspired Apostles established, was *the* Church, to which He gave His Commission, and promised His perpetual presence, with the assurance of final victory, the author sees only the Invisible Church now, as the *true* Church, and he looks forward to the resurrection of the Elect Church as the period of the Church's victory and glory. In all this, we see the origin of another marked feature of one of the Sects. As the "Elect," the Calvinists are to judge the earth by and by, in virtue of their election, so they think it their prerogative, as far as they can get the power, to begin to judge the Earth now. And here we see the secret of that intermeddling, that impertinence, that domineering, intolerant spirit, which Calvinism uniformly exhibits. It is a feature of the System as such; and is only one instance in which Calvinism and Romanism resemble each other, in their pretended succession to ancient Judaism. Judge Jones's whole theory is built on a fallacy as to the nature of the Church; that fallacy is the fruit of his Calvinism; and Calvinism was, in its beginning, a natural reaction from Romish corruption.

Another noticeable feature of this Millenarian theory is its natural effect and bearing on the missionary work of the Church. That work, in reality, is one of self-sacrifice, of faith, of prayer, and yet of promise and of final victory. This Millenarian theory has to some extent crept into the Church; how far we do not know; but no one can hold it, and have such faith in the efficiency of Church instrumentalities as he ought. The great and only end of the Christian Ministry, according to this Millenarian theory, is "preaching the Gospel *for a witness* to the people." Its great end, according to Holy Scripture, is, that the Kingdoms of this world may "become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ;" when "they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowl-

edge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea;" when that prayer shall be answered, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven." It is in this light, that this modern Millenarian theory, which rests only on a private Calvinistic interpretation of Scripture, is full of mischief. It will weaken faith, dry up charity, and rob the Church of her power.

Perhaps there is no one passage which more clearly conveys the author's peculiar views than the following. The reader will notice that the only argument offered is a mere assumption :

"As John's baptism had respect to the Kingdom he preached to the Jews, so the baptism the apostles were to administer has respect to the Kingdom they were to preach to all nations. As the purpose of John's ministry and baptism terminated with the rejection and death of Christ—that is, with the withdrawal of the kingdom from the Jews as a nation, Mat. xxi. 43—so the purpose of this ministry and baptism committed to the apostles and their successors will terminate with the resurrection of the Elect Church and the second coming of Christ in that same Kingdom which the Jews rejected. Both baptisms had respect to the coming of one and the same Kingdom, and both to an *elect* people, but not the same people. The subjects of John's baptism were that generation of Jews to whom he was sent, but the subjects of Christian baptism are professed believers of all nations. The water which John applied was but an emblem of the Holy Spirit. The element was continued, but it is still only an emblem of that same Divine energy which the Lord, as the architect of his Church, (Mat. xvi, 18,) keeps in his own power. The apostles and the ministry which, instrumentally, they established, apply the element to multitudes, as John did, while the Lord baptizes (with the Holy Spirit) those only whom the Father has given him." pp. 541-2.

Of course, anything like a verbal criticism upon these "Notes on Scripture" we cannot attempt now. The work is creditable to the scholarship of the author, while at the same time it is an illustration of the vagaries into which even a learned and devout man may fall, who ignores the teaching of the Church, and who, moulded in his opinions by a metaphysical, modern system, attempts to dogmatize concerning things which are not fully revealed. Such dogmatism is never safe, or profitable; unhappily, as we have already said, in the present instance, it is far enough from being harmless.

HISTORY OF RATIONALISM; Embracing a Survey of the present state of Protestant Theology. By the REV. JOHN F. HURST, A. M. With Appendix of Literature. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1865. 8vo pp. 624.

Considering the basis on which Mr. Hurst has written his work, his History of Rationalism must be pronounced a valuable contribution to our current literature. It is an elaborate *resumé* of Rationalism since the Reformation; its origin, its methods, its objects, its modes of attack, its most prominent writers, and its results. He be-

gins with the disputes between the Reformers themselves, Luther, Calvin and Zuinglius; notes the writings of the Mystics, Bœhme and Arndt; traces the demoralizing effects of the Thirty Years War, an outward victory, but an inward spiritual desolation; and describes the labors of the Pietists, Spener, and Francke, and Bengel. It was at this period that the popular Philosophy of Germany sprang up, of Wolf and Kant; who, seizing the Deism of English writers, Locke, and Herbert, and Shaftsbury, and Collins, and Wollaston, divested it of its grossness, and moulded it into decency and philosophical order. From being an avowed enemy to Orthodoxy, Rationalism now put on the guise of friendship; and such men as Semler and Lessing, appear upon the stage, and Fichte and Schelling, who, improving upon Kant's *Pure Reason*, sought to avoid the difficulties to which the Kantian Philosophy was liable. Then came men of a more conservative type, DeWette and Schleiermacher and Neander; and on the other hand, the destructives, such as Strauss, who did little more than reproduce Bolingbroke and Voltaire in a new dress. The writings of a more "Evangelical School" are noted,—Tholuck and Lange, and Rothe, and Schenkel, and Hengstenberg. The author also traces, with some minuteness, the progress of Rationalism in Holland; and in France, where the Positive Philosophy of Comte appears, reëchoed afterwards by Buckle; and the Critical School of Theology develops itself, Scherer, Larroque, and Renan. Next we have England with Coleridge, Hare, Maurice, and Kingsley, and Carlyle; and last of all, the Essayists and Reviewers, and Colenso, Arnold and Stanley. The concluding chapters are devoted to Rationalism in the United States; and we have the slightest possible glimpse of Unitarianism from the silver-toned echoes of Channing to the last blasphemies of Theodore Parker.

Such is the mere outline of a History, which fills a large octavo volume. Mr. Hurst is professedly of the Orthodox School. The great defect of his History, as we have already intimated, is in the stand-point from which he writes. What is the true province of Reason in Religion? In what respect is it a "verifying faculty"? That is the great question which underlies and conditions all modern thought and speculation in Religion. A false position here is the fountain of all modern Heresy. The almost utter failure of the Continental Reformation finds in this one cardinal mistake its explanation, and its only method of remedy. Yet Mr. Hurst does not recognize this fundamental mistake of modern Protestantism.

We have still another criticism to make upon the work. The author supposes Rationalism to be of modern origin; and to have sprung up on, and from, the decay of true spiritual life among professed Christians. On the contrary, no small amount of these late attacks upon the Gospel are a mere repetition of what Celsus attempted as early as the second century, and, apparently, with quite as much skill and ability, as his modern imitators have exhibited.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. III and IV. Small 8vo. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1865. pp. 480, 508.

These two additional volumes in the republication of Froude's History of England, confirm the opinion of the author and of his work which was expressed in a late number of this Review. We have nothing to qualify in the admiration then bestowed upon the vigor of style and warmth of tone with which the author has enlivened his pages. In tracing the personal history of the author himself, however, and in noting the changes in his religious opinions, in which we find a key to certain characteristics of his present work, we did not then discover what is now apparent. He does not now seem to be a disciple of the sneering, heartless cynic, Carlyle. He seems rather to have imbibed the sentiments of what is popularly called the "Muscular Christianity" School, which is "broad" enough to cover within its scope almost every phase of infidelity from open Deism to practical Atheism. Certain it is, that Mr. Froude has in his volumes no conception or appreciation of the great issues which were at stake in that grand movement, in which Henry VIII, unconsciously to himself, was playing so conspicuous a part. Mr. Froude, with all his brilliancy of manner, and adroitness of management, is nothing more than a special pleader. He uses a microscope well, but he cannot see well through a telescope. He analyzes and dissects, and he does it skillfully; but he lacks in power of comprehension and generalization.

We cannot fully justify this criticism within our present limits. But take any one of the great facts or events in the last nine years of the reign of Henry VIII, comprised within the compass of these two volumes. Take the divorce of Catherine of Arragon and the King's marriage with Anne Boleyn; which Mr. Froude says was prompted by the King's love of his people and conscientious convictions. Pshaw! There is testimony enough, which the author has not even alluded to, in proof, that that lecherous old hypocrite had other desires, more ignoble, which he hoped to gratify. So also, in respect to the suppression of the Monasteries and Religious Houses, of which there were in all nearly seven hundred,—three hundred and seventy-six of which the King confiscated, that he might enrich his own coffers, and those of his creatures. Mr. Froude would have us believe, that he was prompted by his horror of the corruptions existing in those Institutions, and by his regard for the honor of Religion! Notwithstanding all that Spellman and others, and especially the Romish writers have stated, the disclosures made in such works as the volume by Mr. Wright in the Camden Society Publications, are enough to show, that there was a vicious principle, and enough of vicious practice, in those Monasteries to justify interference. But Henry VIII was actuated mainly in his devastations, as we believe, by his unprincipled rapacity. He thought it would "pay" to turn

reformer. Meanwhile, there was going on, in the hearts of his people, and amongst the leaders of the English Church, a change and depth of conviction and feeling in respect to the Faith and Institutions of the Gospel of which he knew little, and, as we believe, cared less. We write the more strongly, because Mr. Froude has set himself to work, to reverse the popular judgment of Henry's character. He has used his materials cleverly, but he has utterly failed in his attempt. The Fourth Volume concludes with the death of the King. Again we say, the volumes possess great interest, and should be read carefully, but not blindly.

MAN, MORAL AND PHYSICAL; or, the Influence of Health and Disease on Religious Experience. By the REV. JOSEPH H. JONES, D.D. Philadelphia. J. S. Claxton. 1865. 12mo., pp. 324.

The influence of physical causes, not only on moral character and on moral feeling, but also on feeling and temperament which have really no moral character or almost none, is a most important subject, and eminently worthy of more attention than it has received. Dr. Jones traces the relations between man's physical and spiritual nature, clearly and sensibly; and he shows how these relations affect the religious experience of the individual. The following observations are worth quoting.

"No person, accustomed to notice his various religious frames, can have failed to perceive that these are closely allied to what is usually denominated his 'constitution.' Is there such a blending of the juices of the animal economy as to produce what is called a nervous temperament, or that excess of bile which makes it melancholy? Is the man gentle or serene, sanguine or timid, cheerful or sad, you will find that these idiosyncracies will not be merged and lost in the changes wrought by regenerating grace. His religion will not so neutralize and remove the cause of his lowness of spirits, his timidity, or whatever it may be that is peculiar to his nature, as to make him at all times cheerful and self possessed. The bashful man will be a bashful Christian; and the bold man, constitutionally, will be bold in a state of grace. * * * Many of those sighs, and tears, and morbid, depressed feelings which Christians speak of as the result of spiritual darkness and desertion of God, are merely the result of physical derangement,—the penalty often for the violation of the laws of health. The atmosphere we breathe is enough to account for them. They come and go, rise and fall, with the mercury in the tube. These are cases not for the spiritual, but for the bodily physician. Their cure is in attendance to the usual laws and prescriptions which regulate the healthy action of the bodily functions.

* * * Sometimes the cause begins in the body and thence proceeds to the mind; sometimes begins in the mind, and thence distempers the body."

It ought to be added, that there are doctrinal teachings which so distort the character of God, as naturally to produce gloom and des-

pondency, especially in the minds of thoughtful, refined and self-distrusting persons; but this is a line of thought which the author does not pursue. The book is full of biographical illustrations; and is well worthy the attention of pastors, who are often called to meet questions of religious experience, and sometimes of great difficulty.

SHERMAN'S MARCH THROUGH THE SOUTH. With Sketches and Incidents of the Campaign. By Capt. DAVID P. CONYNGHAM. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1865. 12mo., pp. 431.

This is one of the books on the late Civil War, which will have permanent value. The author joined Sherman's army at Chattanooga in March, 1864, and served through the campaign as volunteer aide-camp, and war correspondent of the New York Herald. Gen. Grant had just been appointed Lieutenant-General and Commander-in-Chief of the armies of the United States, and Gen. Sherman had succeeded him as Commander of the Division of the Mississippi. There was planned, and by these two men, that grand Campaign, one of the greatest if not the greatest in the history of all modern warfare, by which the War should be, and was, brought to a termination. It involved thousands of miles of marching, the capture of numerous fortified towns and cities, and the breaking up of the enemies' lines of communication and supplies; and its final consummation was to be the surrender of the Army of Richmond. This was the plan, and it was carried out to the very letter. The daring movement from Atlanta to the sea-coast through Georgia, however, was Sherman's own conception, as now appears from Lieut. Gen. Grant's official Report.

The author of this volume, Mr. Conyngham, has all the rare and necessary qualifications of a narrator of such a story. Geographical and local positions and defenses, social customs, prejudices, alienations and fierce antagonisms; the darings, plottings and bloody combats of the battle-field; the glowing narratives of individual heroism; the varied incidents of the great March, from the Battle of Resaca, May 14, 1864, to the final proposal of surrender by Gen. Johnston, Apr. 14, 1865—all these are related with the graphic power of a well drawn picture. The Appendix contains a Sketch of the Life of Gen. Sherman, and several of his most important official papers.

MR. AMBROSE'S LETTERS ON THE REBELLION. By JOHN P. KENNEDY. New York. Hurd & Houghton. 1865. 12mo., pp. 246.

These Letters of Mr. Ambrose, published in the "*National Intelligencer*," by Mr. Seaton, to whom they were addressed, were written at intervals, from the close of the second year of the Civil War, down to the restoration of peace. The object of the writer, is to expose the fallacies, to show the unsoundness, and to demonstrate the utter impracticability of that school of political philosophy on which the late Rebellion rested in its incipient stages, and on which it subsequently

sought to justify itself before the civilized world. Mr. Kennedy republishes them now, that the fixed conclusions and determinations of the War may find a firmer and more lasting hold in the deep convictions of the understanding and the judgment. The Letters are ably, clearly, and pointedly written; and they discuss some of the great questions as to the nature of our Government; questions which must and will be met, in a manner worthy of careful attention.

A COLLECTION OF HYMNS. Reported to the General Convention of 1865, by the Committee of Hymns and Psalms, with the Resolution, that they be licensed for use in Public Worship, until otherwise ordered by the Convention. Philadelphia. 1865. 8vo., pp. 36.

The Joint Committee on Metrical Psalmody and Hymnody, appointed by the Convention of 1862, and which reported this Collection of Hymns, consisted of the Right Rev. Bishops Burgess, Whittingham, A. Potter, H. Potter, Talbot, and Stevens; Rev. Drs. Howe, A. C. Coxe, W. H. Muhlenberg; Rev. J. F. Young, Rev. Francis Wharton; Mr. Henry Coppée and Mr. Samuel Eliot.

It appears that this Report was the work of only a portion of the Committee; and a minority Report was also read, signed by the Rt. Rev. Bishops Whittingham and Coxe, and the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg, disagreeing with the Report of the majority, on the plea that too little care and labor had been bestowed on the Collection proposed. After a free and excited discussion, the following Resolution was adopted by the House:—

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the whole subject of the Hymnody of the Church be referred to a Commission, to be composed of Bishops Burgess, Potter, Coxe, Williams, and Stevens; which Commission may act during the recess of the General Convention, and that the said Commission may, from time to time, set forth any hymn or hymns which may be approved by the entire Commission; and such hymns may be used in the congregations of this Church until otherwise ordered by the General Convention, but they shall not be incorporated with the Prayer Book until adopted by the General Convention.

As the whole subject has been disposed of thus, it is of course unnecessary to criticise the action of the Committee. By what canon of criticism these *fifty-one* of the old Hymns were rejected, and these *one hundred and forty-three* admitted, it is difficult to conjecture. We conclude that there was no canon adopted at all; but that everything was left to individual fancy or caprice. There is, indeed, an imperious demand for a thorough revision of the Hymnology of the Church, and of the whole musical Services of our Worship also; but, it surely is not necessary to exchange one lot of sentimental doggerel for another, any more than it is, that we shall be compelled, throughout the whole season of Lent, to sing the *Cantate Domino*, or the *Bonum est confiteri*, between the Lessons. There are, in our Prayer Book, a few

really choice Hymns, well adapted to Public Worship; and there are, among those which are thrown out in this Collection, several which, with all their deficiencies, devout Churchmen will not willingly part with, and which will not suffer in comparison with any of the new ones in the Collection before us. If the above Commission, who may well be trusted with such a work, would set forth a large Collection, say of five hundred Hymns for present experimental use, which they have a right to do, and the materials are abundant, we should have in the end, perhaps, what the Church so much needs.

LIFE AND CHARACTER OF J. H. VAN DER PALM, D.D., Professor of Oriental Languages and Antiquities and of Sacred Poetry and Eloquence in the University of Leyden. Sketched by NICOLAAS BEETS, D.D. Translated from the Dutch, by J. P. WESTERVELT. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1865. 12mo., pp. 401.

The subject of of this Biography was born in Rotterdam, July 17, 1763. His father kept a boarding-school there, and afterwards at Delfthaven, from whence the old Puritans set sail for America. Van der Palm entered the University at Leyden in his fifteenth year, and at the age of twenty-one was received as a candidate for the Presbyterian Ministry, by the Classis of Leyden and the Lower Rhine, and became minister in the quiet village of Maartensdijk. His ignoble flight from his post on a Sunday, in consequence of the civil troubles of the day, was not very creditable to him, nor does he seem to have had much fondness or regard for his profession. He had been a habitual attendant of the theatre, and his biographer says he was eminently "skilled" as a card-player. After holding several positions in connection with the Government, he became Professor in his University in 1806, and retired from active duty in 1833, at the age of seventy. More than half of this volume is filled with an Appendix containing Van der Palm's literary productions, funeral Addresses, his Sermons, &c. The Biography, which is the production of his grandson by marriage, is in a style of labored eulogium; and the Sermons of Van der Palm are common-place. The volume has some interest for the insight it gives into the practical workings of Dutch Presbyterianism, and of the Dutch system of Education.

HISTORY OF FRIEDRICH THE SECOND; called Frederick the Great. By THOMAS CARLYLE. In six Volumes, Vol. V. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 12mo., pp. 515.

The whole period comprised in this volume extends but a little over three years; but they were years of some of the hardest fighting in the whole Seven Years' War, and in which Frederick exhibited his wonderful resources in meeting and combatting almost all of the combined Powers of Europe. Carlyle grasps his subject with all his might. His graphic descriptions; his fondness for paradox; his perpetual apothegms; his constant suggestiveness; his sustained vigor,

which never trips or halts; his freedom from the conventionalisms of style—are all exhibited in full force. At this stage of the War, in 1760, amid “this avalanche of impending destructions,” as Carlyle calls them, it is characteristic of Frederick, that he found both the time, and leisure, and disposition, to edit a new edition of his Poems, a feat which calls forth one of the richest episodes of Carlyle. The Correspondence, too, of Frederick and Voltaire, “the estranged lovers,” at this period, elicits some of Carlyle’s choicest tit-bits of spicy criticism. The admirers of Carlyle will pronounce this one of the best volumes of the work.

FAMILY PRAYERS; With Forms for Occasional and Private Use. By the Rt. Rev. HENRY W. LEE, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese of Iowa. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1865. 12mo., pp. 181.

Although the leading features of this new Family Prayer Book are somewhat negative in their character, they are still commendable. Our only exception to them is, that they do not more earnestly and distinctly harmonize with that system of Christian life, nurture, and growth, which are provided in the Church. The Prayers are, to a large extent, composed of language taken from the Prayers, Psalter, and Offices of the Prayer Book, and from Holy Scripture. In its Occasional Prayers, the work is quite full and complete.

PRISON LIFE IN THE SOUTH: at Richmond, Macon, Savannah, Charleston, Columbia, Charlotte, Raleigh, Goldsborough, and Andersonville, during the years 1864 and 1865. By A. O. ABBOTT, late Lieutenant First New York Dragoons. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 12mo., pp. 374.

This full title page indicates the contents of the volume. Besides the experience of the author, he gives also the contributions of eight other United States officers, whose adventures and sufferings are related in their own words. It is a horrible story. Even humanity shrinks back from some of the disclosures. It seems like recalling an awful dream. Yet all this was a reality, and the half has never been told. Such a book as this, revolting as the story is, should be read and read thoroughly.

REMINISCENSES, HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL, of sixty-four years in the Ministry. By Rev. HENRY BOEHM, Bishop Asbury’s travelling companion, and executor of his last will and testament. Edited by Rev. Joseph B. Wakely. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1865. 12mo., pp. 493.

This Henry Boehm was born in 1775, and is now ninety years of age. His “Reminiscences,” even when pruned and clipped by the Editor, show how illiterate the author was; yet the volume has a certain sort of interest and value, as an exhibition of the real character

of Methodism when it was an element of power in the land. That phase of Methodism is gone; the Methodist preachers of that peculiar type are nearly all gone; and the special mission of Methodism seems to have gone also.

PROCEEDINGS at the Inauguration of FREDERICK A. P. BARNARD, S. T. D., LL. D., as President of Columbia College, Oct. 3d, 1864. Published by order of the Board of Trustees. New York: Hurd & Houghton: 1865. 8vo., pp. 106.

This neatly published volume is very creditable to all concerned. The day appointed for the Inauguration was the *one hundred and tenth* Anniversary of the foundation of the College; and all the services were fitly arranged. The Address of the Hon. Hamilton Fish, LL. D., Chairman of the Board of Trustees, was in excellent taste; and the Reply of President Barnard, in which he alluded to his experience as an educator at the South, and to the sad termination of his labors, was a noble outpouring of his heart. His Inaugural Discourse was mainly devoted to the relation of Physical Science to Revealed Religion; and he depicted, with great clearness and force, the evils, so common, of the study of the one, to the neglect of the study of the other.

Both are in harmony; yet both have their distinct spheres. We may add, that precisely what those two spheres are, is one of the great questions of our time. Pius IX. has made one terrible mistake respecting it in one direction. Such men as Buckle, and Draper, and Darwin, and Huxley, and Lyell, are making another mistake in the opposite direction. It is a hopeful sign of the times, when such a man as Dr. Barnard, a thorough scholar and a sincere believer in Christianity, is placed at the head of one of our most influential Colleges. Some of the readers of this Review will remember the attempt that was made a few years ago to make this College a fountain of skepticism. Its Church character, and this alone, saved the Institution to Christianity, so far as the influence of Physical Science is concerned. We refer the reader to the Article "Has Religion any thing to do with our Colleges?" *Am. Qu. Church Review*, Vol. VII., pp. 259-289.

PASTORAL LETTER of the Rt. Rev. H. Potter, D.D., D.C.L. With Replies of the Revs. S. H. Tyng, D.D., E. H. Canfield, D.D., John Cotton Smith, D.D., W. A. Muhlenberg, D. D. New York: John A. Gray & Green. New York: 1865.

The authors of these attacks upon the Bishop and upon his Pastoral, for they are really nothing more and nothing less than this,—by stitching all their gatherings together, have made one quite thick pamphlet, which has been scattered freely over the Church, and circulated also among the Sects, where it finds, of course, sympathizers and admirers. To add to its weight, if not to its bulk, the *Episcopal Recorder* lately tells its *confreres* among the Sects, that "no serious attempt has been made to answer them;" and so, deliberately seeks to give the impres-

sion to outsiders, that these attacks represent the unchallenged opinion of the Church. We do not ask the *Recorder* if this is truthful. We cannot correct such a gross and injurious misstatement, for our pages do not circulate freely in that direction. We do remind the Recorder, however, that in the judgment of a good many people, quite as intelligent, quite as honest, and quite as disinterested as the *Recorder*, so far as there is any such thing as *argument* in the above bundle of "Replies," that argument has not only been "answered," but utterly annihilated. So far as they are made up of the overflowing of bitter personalities, of self-conceit, and self-will, doubtless it may be claimed, that they have not been "answered." It is amusing with what an innocent face and with what adroitness, a certain class of men can manage to dodge what they do not care to meet fairly and squarely. Zoologists describe a certain animal whose head will still continue to bite for a long time after it has been completely cut off.

TEMPERANCE ESSAYS, and Selections from different Authors, collected and Edited by EDWARD C. DELAVAN, South Balston, N. Y. Also a Treatise on Tobacco, by Gen. JOHN H. COCKER, of Virginia, late President of the American Temperance Union. Albany. 1865. 12mo., pp. 268.

Mr. Delavan, whose name has been so prominently connected with the Temperance movement for the last thirty years or more, has here collected in one volume *twenty-one* of the most important papers, Reports, &c., &c., issued in various quarters and by various individuals and public bodies, during this period. Notwithstanding all that has been done in the way of shaping public sentiment, and by legislative prohibition, it is an alarming fact that Intemperance is still frightfully prevalent, and is said to be increasing. We are informed that, up to the year 1864, there had been 7,245 applications for places in the New York State Inebriate Asylum at Binghamton, from every State in the Union, and from Europe, Mexico, and the British Province, 520 of whom were opium-eaters. There were 39 clergymen, 8 judges, 197 lawyers, 226 physicians, 340 merchants, 680 mechanics, 466 farmers; 240 gentlemen and 805 women. One of the opium-eaters, a lawyer, who had filled a highly responsible office, in one year drank 2,200 bottles of McMunn's preparation of opium. In one day he drank twenty bottles, equal to ten thousand drops of laudanum. The astounding fact was stated at the recent Temperance Convention at Saratoga, that the names of 1,300 rich men's daughters are on the list of applicants for admission to this Asylum. There is not a doubt that Intemperance is, or becomes, a physical disease; and that for it there is no remedy but total and perpetual abstinence. Patients at the Asylum at Binghamton are received for not less than a year, are watched, controlled, and medically treated. The expectation is that at least seventy per cent. will be radically cured. The great and only hope for society at large, however, is in the stand to be taken and maintained by the Clergy, and other leaders of public opinion, both by

precept and example; by parents, teachers, and by all who have the care of moulding the character of the young. It will not do to sneer at facts like those embodied in this volume. The man who will do it is a monster.

A CHARGE to the Clergy of the Diocese of Connecticut. By J. WILLIAMS, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese, delivered in St. Thomas' Church, New Haven, June 13, 1865. 8vo., pp. 22.

It is significant, that the Primary Charge of Bishop Williams should be devoted, as it is, to the doctrine of the Eternal Punishment of the wicked. There is no question that the false philosophy of John Calvin, on which his whole system of Theology was based, has led, by necessary sequence, to those loose notions respecting Eternal Punishment, which now prevail so extensively in New England. The Bishop's argument covers every phase of the subject which the denial of this doctrine has ever assumed; such as false philosophical views of the character of God, and wrong interpretations of Holy Scripture. He also states clearly the doctrine of the Church Catholic, and the authoritative decision of our own Branch of the Church. His suggestions, as to the proper mode of preaching the doctrine, are sensible and timely. The Bishop's examination, though brief, is exhaustive and conclusive.

ETERNAL PENALTY. Nine Essays from "The North-Western Church." By HUGH MILLER THOMPSON, Professor of Church History in Nashotah Theological Seminary. Chicago: Street & Pearson. 1865. 12mo., pp. 74.

These "Essays," which were originally contributed to the "North Western Church," are admirably adapted to circulation among the people. The various forms of objection are handled in detail; and as Prof. Thompson is a clear and bold thinker, so his language has the same terse, vigorous character. There is no trimming and toning down of his sentences into amiable platitudes. All will read the volume, and all will understand it. The positive teaching of Scripture is first clearly stated; and the author then defends the doctrine of Eternal Punishment against the various popular sophistries of the day; such as, that God is all-merciful, and all-powerful; that the terms, "fire," and "worm," &c., are figurative; that men are punished enough in this world; that temporal offenses do not deserve eternal penalties; that the object of all punishment is the reformation of the offender, &c., &c. There is, undoubtedly, throughout the country, a growing indifference or unbelief, as to this doctrine of Endless Punishment; and, consequently, there is an increasing neglect of those conditions on which alone Eternal Happiness is to be secured. It is worthy of remark, how the Church is thus everywhere meeting the different forms in which the Infidelity of our day presents itself.

NOTES FROM PYLMOUTH PULPIT; a Collection of Memorable Passages from the Discourses of Henry Ward Beecher. With a Sketch
VOL. XVII. 56

of Mr. Beecher and the Lecture Room. By AUGUSTA MOORE. New Edition, Revised and greatly enlarged. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 12mo., pp. 374.

Some female worshipper at the shrine of Henry Ward Beecher, has here collected together, what she regards as the memorable passages of that preacher and speaker; and presents them to the public. Her sketch of Mr. Beecher, his looks, his personal habits, his dress, his nose, and lips, and hair, &c., &c., is quite worthy of such an adorer; and the "memorable passages" are, evidently, those queer things with which he draws the Brooklyn crowds, who go to stare and gape with admiration, and wonder what the man will say next. The book is, after all, of some value; as it gives the secret of Mr. Beecher's popularity among that class of people. We should have supposed, that a gentleman of sense, refinement, and delicacy of feeling, would have abhorred such grossness of flattery; and would rather have buried in oblivion much of what is here preserved; but the book is published with Mr. Beecher's approbation, and with an Introduction written by himself!

RICHARD COBDEN, the Apostle of Free-Trade. His political career and public services. A Biography. By JOHN MCGILCHRIST, Author of the "Life of Lord Dundonald." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 12mo., pp. 304.

Richard Cobden was born at Medhurst, Sussex, June 3, 1804. Sprung from the people, pushing his way successfully as a tradesman, he soon began to see and feel the social evils which have grown up in England, under the rule of the privileged classes; and, at an early period, he became the acknowledged leader of the opposition, which still rages between the Aristocracy and the People, between Capital and Labor. He entered Parliament in 1841, at the age of thirty-seven years; and engaged at once for the repeal of Corn Laws, Paper duties, &c., and in behalf of the principle of Free-Trade. He died, April 2, 1865. He was buried in Lavington Church yard; and the description of the Funeral Services in West Lavington Church, where titles and dignities gathered to pay honor to the nobility of real worth, is one of the best chapters in the volume. It is, emphatically, an American book. The Messrs. Harper have published it in their very best style.

QUESTIONS FOR THE FIRST HALF OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. By the Rev. WILLIAM R. HUNTINGTON, Rector of All Saints Church, Worcester. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1865. 18mo., pp. 75.

The author says, it is the design of his book, "to familiarize the minds of children with the grand facts of the Incarnation." The Lessons are arranged to embrace the most prominent events in the earthly life of our Saviour; and this, we suppose, is what the author means by the Incarnation. The questions are meagre. Jackson's Questions, which are framed on the same general plan, err in the opposite direction; in being too doctrinal, and withal, written on a Calvinistic basis.

A thoroughly competent teacher, however, will make these "Questions" of Mr. Huntington very useful; but they are not, in themselves, sufficiently suggestive.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECONSTRUCTION. Letters to a Southern Bishop. By Catholicus. 8vo., pp. 8.

Who the author of this querulous, unhistorical, illogical, ill-tempered, pamphlet is, we do not know. It is post-marked at Philadelphia. Its apparent object is, to delay, and perhaps defeat, the work of perfect Union in the Church. The cause of so much ill-humor seems to be, that, under the workings of the General Convention, as now constituted, the tone of sound Churchmanship is steadily improving in the Church, and wanton lawlessness now finds an effective check. A man who dares beard and defy his Bishop, finds it a different matter, to snub the whole Church. The design of the pamphlet is so obvious, and its argument so shallow, that it cannot do the least possible mischief. It has been scattered over certain portions of the Church extensively.

CATALOGUE of the Officers and Students of Yale College. 1865-66. 8vo., pp. 68.

The Catalogue shows an aggregate of 682 students; of whom 97 are in the Senior Class, 107 in the Junior, 130 in the Sophomore, 156 in the Freshman, and 192 in the departments of Theology, Law, Medicine, Philosophy and the Arts. The Library Report is as follows:—College Library, (exclusive of pamphlets,) 44,500 volumes; Linonian Library, 13,000 volumes; Library of the Brothers in Unity, 13,000 volumes; Libraries of the Professional Schools, 5,000 volumes; Total, 75,500 volumes. *

PAPERS OF THE RUSSO-GREEK COMMITTEE; Nos. VI. and VII.

No. VI. contains the celebrated Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, and of course is the Form in the Greek Church for the Administration of the Holy Communion. "This version," says the editor, Rev. J. Freeman Young, S. T. D., "of the Liturgy of the Orthodox Eastern Church, is the result of a collation of two works.—First, the ordinary Greek text of the Liturgy, as given in the Euchologion. This embraces the text and rubrics of the *invariable* portions of the Office. The other work is the Egkolphion (Manual) of Raptane, which gives the text and rubrics of the parts performed by the *choir and people*, with full directions respecting the *variable* portions of the Office."

No. VII. contains the Offices of Holy Baptism and Confirmation, of the Ordination of Deacons, Deaconesses, Priests, and Bishops, and of Confession, according to the use of the Catholic, Orthodox, Eastern Church.

The Editor, Dr. Young, vouches for the accuracy of the translations of these representative works, and his own Notes throw still more

light upon the Doctrines and usages of that Branch of the Church Catholic.

THE RECORDS of Christ Church, New Brunswick, New Jersey. By the Rev. ALFRED STUBBS, S. T. D., Rector of the Parish. 1865. 8vo., pp. 76.

The Rector, Dr. Stubbs, may well be congratulated, as the successor of the distinguished men who have ministered in the same field before him,—Bishops Seabury, Hobart and Croes, and such men as the Rev. Abraham Beach, and still more, that, under his persistent and consistent administration, according to the Order and System of the Church, the Parish has steadily and surely reached its present position of strength. The Records make a valuable Historical pamphlet.

The following new publications have been received. Several of them are particularly suggestive; and such comments as they deserve would fill entire pages of the Review. Our limited space forbids more than their announcement at present.

MISS CAREW. A Novel. By AMELIA B. EDWARDS, Author of "Barbara's History," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 8vo., pp. 141.

THE CHILDREN IN THE WOOD, told in verse, by RICHARD HENRY STODDARD. Illustrated by H. L. Stephens. Large 4to. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. pp. 8.

MARIAN ROOKE; or the Quest for Fortune. By HENRY T. SEDLEY. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1865. 12mo., pp. 475.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. FULFORD's Sermon, at the General Convention, in St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia, Oct. 4, 1865.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. J. TRAVERS LEWIS's Sermon, on Confirmation, in St. George's Cathedral, Kingston, C. W. 1865.

The Ven. Archdeacon MASON's Vindication of the Orders of the English Church, against the objections of Dr. Fletcher. Honolulu. 1865. 8vo., pp. 38.

W. D. ALEXANDER'S REVIEW of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Staley's Pastoral Address. Honolulu. 1865. 8vo., pp. 87.

PRESIDENT KERFOOT'S Inaugural Address, at Trinity College, June 28, 1865.

REV LEWIS BARTON'S Memorial Sermon, in St. John's Church, Cleveland, Ohio, July 30, 1865.

REV. B. H. PADDOCK'S Sermon, in memory of Miss Eliza S. Trowbridge, in Christ Church, Detroit, Mich., July 9, 1865.

THE TRUE GENEALOGY of the Dunnel and Dwinell Family of New England. By HENRY GALE DUNNEL, M. D., of New York City. New York: Charles B. Richardson. 1862. Large 8vo., pp. 84.

AN ORAL CATECHISM, for Young Children, and those who cannot read. By Rev. E. M. Forbes. Rector of Christ Church, Elizabeth City, N. C. New York: H. B. Durand. 1865. 16mo., pp. 84.

Dr. HENRY D. PAINE's Address before the Homœopathic Medical Society of the State of New York, May 10, 1865. Albany: 1865. 8vo., pp. 22.

REPORTS, &c., of the Board of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary. New York: 1865.

FOURTH ANNUAL CATALOGUE of St. Stephen's College. Annandale, N. Y. 1865-6.

TWENTY-SECOND Annual Report of the New York Association, for Improving the Condition of the Poor. New York: 1865. 8vo., pp. 88.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF TENNESSEE.

The Consecration of the Rev. CHARLES TODD QUINTARD, formerly Rector of the Church of the Advent, Nashville, Tenn., took place at St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 11th. The opening Services were read by Rev. Mr. Collins, of Tennessee. The *Venite* followed. The whole musical portion of the Services was admirably rendered by a volunteer choir of clergymen. The first Lesson, 62d Isaiah, was read by Archdeacon Leach, of Montreal, Canada; and the second, 20th Acts, by Rev. Mr. Burgess, of Maine. The remainder of the Morning Prayer was also read by Rev. Mr. Burgess. The 106th Selection of Psalms was announced by Rev. Dr. Howe, of Philadelphia, and sung to the old tune, "Mear." The Ante-Communion Service was commenced by the Lord Bishop of Montreal, who read the Collect and Commandments. The special Collect and Epistle for the Consecration Service, were read by Bishop Smith, of Kentucky. The Gospel was read by Bishop Kemper, of Wisconsin. The 97th hymn, "Go forth ye Heralds," was sung to "Old Hundred," and the Sermon was preached by Bishop Stevens, from Corinthians, ii., 1, 2. At the conclusion of the Sermon, the Consecration Service commenced. The Bishop elect was presented by Bishops Potter and Lay. The Testimonials from the Diocese of Tennessee were read by Rev. Dr. Cummins. The Testimonials from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by Rev. Secretary Randall; and the Testimonials from the House of Bishops, by Rev. Secretary Balch. The Consecration then proceeded, as set forth in the Ordinal for the Consecration of Bishops. The Consecrating Bishops were the Lord Bishop of Montreal, Bishops Hopkins, Burgess, Bedell, Odenheimer, Stevens and Cox. The Services were concluded with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

CONSECRATION OF THE MISSIONARY BISHOP OF NEBRASKA.

The Rev. ROBERT H. CLARKSON, D. D., Rector of St. James' Church, Chicago, Ill., who was elected by the late General Convention, Missionary Bishop of Nebraska and Dacotah, was Consecrated in St. James' Church, Chicago, Nov. 15th. There were present six Bishops, viz: the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hopkins, the Presiding Bishop; Bishop Kemper, of Wisconsin; Bishop McCoskry, of Michigan; Bishop Lee, of Iowa; Bishop Whipple, of Minnesota; and Bishop Talbot, Assistant Bishop of Indiana; and also fifty-eight Priests and Deacons. Morning Prayer was commenced by Rev. Dr. Bishop, who read to the Creed, the Rev. Mr. Nash reading the First Lesson, and Rev. C. P. Clark the Second Lesson. The Rev. Dr. DeKoven read the Prayers. The 79th Selection was then sung. In the Ante-Communion Service, Bishop Kemper read the Collects, Bishop McCoskry the Epistle, and Bishop Lee the Gospel. The 25th Hymn was then sung. The Sermon was preached by Bishop Whipple, from the text, 2 Timothy, ii., 15. Bishops Kemper and Talbot presented the Bishop elect. Rev. C. Locke read the testimonial of the action of the House of Bishops, in the election of Dr. Clarkson. Rev. Dr. Cummins read the like testimonial of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with the names of the Deputies. Rev. Clinton Locke read the consent of the House of Bishops to the Consecration of Rev. R. H. Clarkson, D. D. Bishop Talbot read the Litany and the Prayer following. The Presiding Bishop proceeded with the Consecration Service, the Bishops present joining him in the laying on of hands. The 105th Hymn was sung by the Choir and Clergy, preceding which it was announced that the Offertory would be for missionary use in the Diocese of

Nebraska. Bishop Lee read the Offertory, with the Prayer for Christ's Church Militant. Bishop McCoskry read the Exhortation and the following to the Consecration proper. Bishop Hopkins consecrated the Elements. After the administration of the Lord's Supper, of which a large number partook, Bishop Kemper read the Prayers following, Bishop Hopkins pronouncing the Benediction.

In a day or two after the Consecration, the young Bishop was on his way to his distant field of hardship. In a previous farewell Sermon to his parishioners, he said:—"I know that the decision is right, and I want your fullest acquiescence. God knows I feel deeply and keenly my personal unfitness to take my stand in line with the Hebers, and Selwyns, and Paynes, and Kempers, and Talbots, and Whipples, who have illustrated, in glowing pictures, the missionary annals of the Church. But I have the prayer of God's people and the promises of God's Word to uphold me."

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

| <i>Name.</i> | <i>Bishop.</i> | <i>Time.</i> | <i>Place.</i> |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Bancroft, Jos. W. | McCoskry, | Sept. 19, 1865, | Trinity, Marshall, Mich. |
| Hammond, T. E. | Johns, | Sept. 24, " | St. James', Richmond, Va. |
| Husband, Charles, | Hopkins, | Sept. 13, " | St. James', Arlington, Vt. |
| Lobdell, Francis, | Bedell, | Aug. 31, " | Chapel, Gambier, Ohio. |
| Milburn, W. H. | Hopkins, | Nov. 26, " | St. Paul's, Burlington, Vt. |
| Satterlee, N. Y. | Potter, | Nov. 21, " | St. Paul's, Flatbush, N. Y. |

PRIESTS.

| <i>Name.</i> | <i>Bishop.</i> | <i>Time.</i> | <i>Place.</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Rev. Anstice, Henry, | Potter, | Nov. 21, 1865, | St. Paul's, Flatbush, N. Y. |
| " Baker, Alfred B. | Odenheimer, | Sept. 24, " | Christ, New Brunswick, N. J. |
| " Baker, R. J. | Johns, | Sept. 24, " | St. James', Richmond, Va. |
| " Bird, S. M. | Johns, | Sept. 24, " | St. James', Richmond, Va. |
| " Darby, Henry, | Coxe, | Sept. 24, " | Trinity, Rochester, N. Y. |
| " Duff, Geo. M. | Coxe, | Sept. 24, " | Trinity, Rochester, N. Y. |
| " Fay, H. Warren, | Potter, | Nov. 21, " | St. Paul's, Flatbush, N. Y. |
| " Fryer, Otho H. | Stevens, | Oct. 31, " | Christ, Lebanon, Penn. |
| " Gardner, W. F. | Johns, | Sept. 24, " | St. James', Richmond, Va. |
| " Gibson, George, | Kemper, | Aug. 24, " | Christ, Green Bay, Wis. |
| " Hoshing, A. C. | Potter, H. | Sept. 15, " | Grace, White Plains, N. Y. |
| " Hutchins, Charles L. | Chase, | Oct. 1, " | Holy Communion, N. Y. City. |
| " Hyde, J. W. | Potter, | Nov. 21, " | St. Paul's, Flatbush, N. Y. |
| " Jennings, A. B. | Talbot, | Aug. 24, " | St. Mary's, Nebraska City, Ne. |
| " Lobdell, Francis, | Mellvaine, | Nov. 19, " | Advent, Walnut Hills, Ohio. |
| " Marshall, Matthias M. | Atkinson, | Sept. 3, " | Emmanuel, Warrenton, N. C. |
| " Meredith, J. M. | Johns, | Sept. 24, " | St. James', Richmond, Va. |
| " Millett, J. H. Hobart, | Stevens, | June 23, " | St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa. |
| " Portmass, J. | Whitehouse, | Sept. 17, " | Bishop's Church, Chicago, Ill. |
| " Stephenson, C. S. | Potter, | Dec. 3, " | St. George's Chap., N. Y. City. |
| " Stubbs, Alfred H. | Odenheimer, | Sept. 24, " | Christ, New Brunswick, N. J. |
| " Tillinghast, John H. | Atkinson, | Sept. 17, " | Christ, Raleigh, N. C. |
| " Walsh, Warren W. | Coxe, | Sept. 24, " | Trinity, Rochester, N. Y. |

CONSECRATIONS.

| <i>Name.</i> | <i>Bishop.</i> | <i>Time.</i> | <i>Place.</i> |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Grace, | Williams, | Sept. 13, 1865, | Windsor, Conn. |
| Grace, | Potter, | Sept. 15, " | White Plains, N. Y. |
| St. James', | Potter, | Nov. 1, " | Fordham, N. Y. |
| St. Paul's, | Stevens, | Oct. 15, " | Chestnut Hill, Penn. |
| St. Peter's, | Eastburn, | Sept. 4, " | Beverly, Mass. |
| | Eastburn, | Nov. 16, " | Oxford, Mass. |

OBITUARIES.

The REV. BAYLIES P. TALBOT, Rector of St. James' Church, Woonsocket, R. I., died at Claremont, N. H., Sept. 5th, 1865. He graduated at Trinity College, in 1842, and at the General Theological Seminary in 1845. He was Rector of St. James' Parish for twenty years.

The REV. J. G. L. Fryer, Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, Rochester, Penn., died at Rochester, Sept. 22, 1865. He graduated at Nashotah, June 11, 1845, and was ordained Deacon the following week in Philadelphia.

The REV. HERMAN HOOKER, D. D., died at Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 26, 1865, aged sixty-one years. He was born at Poultney, Vermont, in 1804; graduated at Middlebury College in 1825; and at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, and was licensed as a Presbyterian Minister, with great promise both as a scholar and speaker. At this period, careful study led him to seek and obtain Holy Orders in the Church; but the partial loss of his sight and of his voice compelled his retirement from the active duties of the Ministry. He became Author, Editor and Publisher. His principal works were; I. *The Portion of the Soul*. Phila., 1835. 32 mo., and republished in England. II. *Popular Infidelity*; Phila., 1836. 12mo. III. *Family Book of Devotion*; 1836. 8vo. IV. *The Uses of Adversity and the Provisions of Consolation*; Phila. 1846. 18mo. V. *Thoughts and Maxims*; Phila., 1847. 16mo. VI. *The Christian Life a Fight of Faith*; Phila., 1848. 18mo. He also published a large number of English and American works; and probably in this way was more eminently useful than he could have been as a Parish Clergyman. Dr. Hooker was a vigorous and close thinker, a clear writer, a thorough Churchman, a devout and conscientious Christian, full of true and consistent charity. He made the Nashotah Seminary a residuary legatee; which bequest will probably amount to about \$10,000. Among the Resolutions adopted by the Clergy at his funeral was the following:

Resolved, That while the published writings of Dr. Hooker present evidence of an intellect and scholarship entitling him to honorable distinction among American authors, the constant demands for his works give proof of the high estimation in which they are held by the Christian public, and the good service he has rendered to the cause of Christ.

REV. JOHN LEITHEAD died at Brownsville, Penn., Sept. 29th, 1865, aged 29 years. He was born in England, Oct. 8, 1836; entered Kenyon College, Ohio, in 1853, and graduated in 1857; entered the Seminary at Gambier in 1858; was ordained Deacon, by Bishop Bowman, in Trinity Church, Pittsburg, Penn., Nov. 24, 1859, and Priest, by the same Bishop, in Christ Church, Brownsville, Penn.,

Dec. 13, 1860; was Rector of St. Mark's Parish, Lewistown, Penn., from 1860 to 1864; and from 1864, was Rector one year of St. James' Parish, Piqua, Ohio.

REV. CHRISTIAN CRUSE, D. D., died at St. Luke's Hospital, New York City, Oct. 5th, 1865, aged 71 years. He was born, June 27, 1794, in Philadelphia, of Lutheran parentage, and Danish nationality. He entered the University of Pennsylvania in 1812, and graduated Jan. 10, 1815, with distinguished honors. He was appointed Professor in that University in 1831, and resigned in 1833. He originated the Philomathean Society in the University. He was ordained by Bishop White about 1822; became Rector of Trinity Parish, Fishkill, N. Y., in April, 1846, but resigned the cure in 1851; and afterwards had no Parish. He soon after removed to the General Theological Seminary, where, as Librarian, he had ample opportunities for those studies in which he was so successful. In the Ancient Languages, Syriac, Hebrew and Greek, Dr. Cruse was one of the most learned men in the Church. The Article in Vol. V. of this Review, on Syriac Literature, and in review of Dr. Murdock's translation of the Peshito version of the New Testament, was from his pen.

The REV. LOT JONES, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, New York City, died in Philadelphia on Thursday, Oct. 12th, aged 68 years. His death was the result of accident in falling upon the pavement at St. Luke's Church, where he was in attendance upon the meeting of the Board of Missions. He was born in Brunswick, Me., Feb. 21, 1797; was not of Church parentage; graduated at Bowdoin College, Me., in 1821; studied for the Ministry, under Bishop Griswold, and was by him ordained Deacon, Jan., 1823, and Priest, Sept., 1823; in 1823 was settled at Marblehead and Marshfield, Mass.; in 1825 at Macon, Ga.; in 1827 at Savannah; in 1828, at Gardiner, Me.; in 1829, at South Leicester, Mass.; and in January 1833, he removed to New York, and took charge of the new Mission Church of the Epiphany. Here he found his true place. His humility, his single-hearted devotion to his one great work, and his untiring industry, made his ministry remarkably effective. In 1858 he published his twenty-fifth Anniversary Discourse. At that time, seven years ago, he said,—During my connection with this church, I have baptized 2501,—253 adults, and 2248 children;—married 750 couples; presented 915 for confirmation; enrolled 1494 as communicants; and attended 1362 funerals. Our present number of communicants is about 400.

The REV. GEO. N. SLEIGHT, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Pleasant Valley, N. Y., died at that place, Oct. 14th, aged 45 years.

REV. NATHAN BOURNE CROCKER, D. D., Rector of St. John's Church, Providence, R. I., died in that city, Oct. 19, 1865, aged 84 years. He was born at Barnstable, Mass., July 4th, 1781; fitted for College at the Academy in Sandwich, where the late Bishop Wain-

wright was a fellow student; graduated at Harvard College, in 1802; commenced the study of Medicine, but soon began study for the Ministry, and was Lay Reader at St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.; was ordained Deacon by Bishop Bass, in Trinity Church, Boston, May 24, 1803, and accepted the Rectorship of St. John's, Providence. At this period, he and the Rev. Mr. Dehon, afterwards Bishop of S. C., were the only Church clergymen in Rhode Island. His health failing, his Rectorship closed, May 24, 1804; but was resumed Jan. 1, 1808, and continued until his death, a period of over 57 years. He was ordained Priest, by Bishop Moore, in Trinity Church, New York, May 18, 1808. He received the Honorary Degree of Doctor in Divinity from Geneva College, in 1827. He was a member of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Rhode Island, during his entire Rectorship, except for a single year; and deputy to the General Convention, from 1808 to 1862. He was proposed for Bishop of Rhode Island, in 1843, 1853 and 1854; and on the latter occasion, was elected by the Clergy, but lacked a majority of the Lay votes. He was also a member of the Board of Fellows of Brown University for nearly fifty years.

The REV. EDWARD WINTHROP, Rector of St. John's Church, Highgate, Vermont, died in New York City, Oct. 21st, 1865, aged 54 years. A sketch of his life will appear in the next number.

CONVERSIONS TO THE CHURCH.

Mr. HIRAM CARLTON, formerly Congregational minister in Massachusetts, has applied to be admitted a Candidate for Holy Orders.

Rev. MATSON M. SMITH, D. D., lately a Congregational Minister in Bridgeport, Conn., has determined to seek Holy Orders in the Church.

Mr. W. A. FULLER, formerly a Unitarian Minister in Massachusetts, has applied to become a Candidate for Holy Orders.

Rev. FRANCIS LOBDELL, lately ordained Priest in Ohio, was formerly a Congregationalist, in Bridgeport.

GENERAL CONVENTION.—The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, assembled in St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia, on Wednesday, Oct. 4th, and continued in session eighteen days. We were not mistaken in our last number, in speaking of it, by anticipation, as the most important Convention ever held in our Branch of the Church. Now that it has met and gone, and its doings are a part of our history, we look back to it with almost unmingled gratitude. There were some differences of opinion, entertained too and avowed by earnest men, but we may truly say, in re-

viewing the doings of the Convention, that the spirit of charity was not grieved, and the great heart of the Church beats once more tranquilly and strongly. We propose to give, in the next Number of the Review, when perfect reports will be before us, a complete digest of all that was really *done*; such as our readers will be glad to preserve as a permanent record. Among the most noticeable features and doings of the Convention, was the presence of so many of the Bishops and Clerical and Lay delegates of the Southern Dioceses; the solemn and formal Thanksgiving for the restoration of Union and Peace; the Consecration of the Bishop of Tennessee; the debates and final important action on the Provincial System; the able and timely Report on Christian Education; the Debates and Resolutions on the important religious movement in Italy; and on the communication and Union with the Russo-Greek Church; the proposed action in behalf of the Freedmen; the division of our Western Territories into Missionary Dioceses, and the election of three new Missionary Bishops; the election of a new Missionary Bishop for China and Japan; and the important discussions and final action in the Board of Missions respecting the African Mission.

The Convention was characterized emphatically by deliberative discussion and positive action, rather than by exhibitions of sentiment. All seemed to feel that it was no time or place "to get up a scene." Yet there was, throughout the sessions, that chastened soberness, and at times that subdued tone, which belongs alone to manly hearts, and which is often more eloquent than words or tears. There were, however, one or two marked events in the course of the Convention, which deserve special mention. They certainly will never fade from the memory of those who participated in them. One such instance was the return of some of the Southern Bishops to their place in the Upper House. The published correspondence of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Potter, Bishop of the largest Diocese in the country, with the Rt. Rev. Bishops Atkinson and Lay, shows the delicacy and depth of feeling with which this formal action was characterized. And when this deed was really consummated, and the seal was set upon a reunited Church; when the horrors of the past, the anxieties of the present, and the hopes and responsibilities of the future were all gathered around that one eventful moment, and then were all baptized with the sweet spirit of charity and mutual confidence; no wonder that strong men bowed and wept. It was the baptism of the HOLY GHOST: and the noble old TE DEUM was the Thanksgiving Hymn of a Kingdom which is not of this world.

We only allude to the spirit and character of this important Convention now, and reserve details for a future Number.

MISSIONARY WORK OF THE CHURCH.—The Reports of the Domestic and Foreign Committees, for the year ending Oct. 1, 1865, are carefully prepared and valuable papers. In the Domestic field, there are now two Missionary Bishops, and one hundred and three other missionaries in active service. This is nine more than the number re-

ported at this time last year. The number employed the whole or some part of the year, is one hundred and twelve. The Treasurer has received during the year, for general purposes, \$63,247 47; and for special purposes not under the control of the Committee, \$9,267 07; being from all sources and for all objects, \$72,514 64. This exceeds the aggregate of last year by \$5,933 45. The Committee acknowledge the efficiency of the Rev. Mr. Twing in raising funds. The aggregate contributions of the parishes visited by him this year, exceed the contributions of the same parishes in the last year, when no visit of an agent was made, by the sum of \$10,212 91. The Spirit of Missions has a circulation of only about 2,000 copies. Everywhere, the work opening before the Church, at the South, and West, and Northwest, is enough to inspire new courage and zeal. The Committee call for one hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the coming year. It is the merest trifle, compared with the Church's ability, and *can* be raised, beyond a doubt. The proposition to give the election of Missionary Bishops to the Board of Missions, was not acceded to. In the long interval between General Conventions, there must be momentum somewhere. The best energies of the Domestic Committee will be called for, or the work will dwindle which is now so largely in their hands.

The Report of the Foreign Committee is encouraging. The receipts for the year from all sources, were \$78,309 48. The expenditures for the same period were—For the Mission in Greece, \$3,310 93; for the Mission in China and Japan, \$8,483 86; for the Mission in Africa \$30,650 46; for the Mission in Mexico, \$6,376 59.

The Mission in Greece, which has been prosecuted with so much wisdom and fidelity, for thirty-five years, by the Rev. Dr. Hill, it is believed will not be abandoned.

In China and Japan, the principal Stations are at Shanghai and Nagasaki. The following are the Missionaries: Rev. Robert Nelson, Rev. Elliott H. Thompson, Rev. Dudley D. Smith, Rev. Samuel I. J. Schereschewsky, Rev. A. C. Höbing, Rev. Wong Hong-Chai, Native Deacon; Mr. Wong Voong Fee, Catechist and Candidate for Orders; Mrs. Nelson, Mrs. Höbing, Miss Lydia M. Fay, Rev. John Ligins, Rev. Channing Moore Williams. The recent appointment of Rev. Mr. Williams as Missionary Bishop, gives new interest and promise to this Mission.

The African Mission reports seven permanent Church buildings, one Hospital, Orphan Asylum, High School, and seven Mission houses, erected at an expense exceeding one hundred thousand dollars. It has ordained four Liberian ministers for four Liberian Churches, and expected soon to ordain a fifth, besides one native minister. There are three Liberian, one foreign, and two native Candidates for Orders. Including the Bishop, there are eight foreign ministers. There are twenty-one mission stations in the four counties of Liberia, along two hundred and fifty miles of coast, and extend eighty miles interior, operating in seven native tribes, with an aggregate population of one hundred and fifty thousand people. Baptisms during the past year,

seventy-eight; forty-nine being adults. Communicants, colonists, one hundred and sixty-eight; natives, one hundred and forty-eight; total, three hundred and sixteen. Boarding scholars, one hundred and thirty-two; day scholars, Liberian and native, seven hundred and sixty. Contributions, (imperfectly reported,) seven hundred and eighty-three dollars and three cents.

The Mission in Mexico is almost entirely conducted by the Rev. E. G. Nicholson, D. D., whose reports show that the opportunity of guiding aright the spirit of inquiry among the Romanists, and of building up the Primitive Church there in that large field, is now, Providentially, in our hands.

The Committee propose the appointment and sending forth of a Bishop who shall have jurisdiction in all those parts of the foreign field not now under the care of any Foreign Missionary Bishop of this Church. The portions of the field which at this time, under such an arrangement as is here proposed, would fall to the oversight of the Foreign Missionary Bishop at large, are Mexico, Japan, China, and Greece.

SOUTHERN GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCH.—This Council met in Augusta, Ga., Nov. 8th, and continued in session three days. There were present as follows:

HOUSE OF BISHOPS.—The Right Rev. Stephen Elliott, D. D., Georgia; the Right Rev. John Johns, D. D., Virginia; the Right Rev. William M. Green, D. D., Mississippi; the Right Rev. Richard H. Wilmer, D. D., Alabama.

HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.—Virginia—Rev. C. W. Andrews, D. D.; Rev. P. Slaughter, Rev. G. H. Norton, Mr. N. H. Massie, Mr. N. B. Meade, Mr. H. Pendleton. South Carolina—Rev. P. Trapier, Rev. C. C. Pinckney, Mr. Edward McCrady. Georgia—Rev. C. F. McRae, Rev. W. H. Clarke, Rev. John D. Easter, Mr. R. D. Moore. Alabama—Rev. J. M. Banister, Rev. H. N. Pierce, D. D.; Rev. J. M. Mitchell, Mr. J. D. Phelan. Mississippi—Rev. J. T. Pickett. Morning Prayer was said by the Rev. Mr. Trapier, assisted by the Rev. Mr. McRae. The Senior Bishop proceeded with the office for the Holy Communion, being assisted in its celebration by the other Bishops present. The Bishops then withdrew, and organized for business by the re-election of the Rev. W. H. Harrison, of Georgia, as their Secretary.

The House of Deputies elected the Rev. Mr. Pinckney, President; the Rev. Mr. Mitchell, Secretary; and the Rev. Mr. Pickett, Assistant Secretary.

The necessary preliminaries having been arranged, and the appointment of the usual Standing Committees ordered, the great subject before the Council, viz: the relations of the several Dioceses comprising it to each other, and to the Church in the United States, was referred to a joint Committee, consisting of Bishop Elliott, on the part of the House of Bishops, and the Rev. Dr. Andrews, and the Rev. Messrs. Trapier and Pickett, and Messrs. Phelan and Moore, on the part of the House of Deputies.

The Committee made a report providing a rule by which the several Dioceses belonging to the Council will govern themselves in determining their future ecclesiastical relations as follows:

Whereas, The several Dioceses, which we as Bishops and Deputies represent at this Council, were impelled by political events to separate, in a legislative capacity, from the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and did decide, upon grounds sanctioned by Holy Scripture and primitive antiquity, to unite together and adopt for their better government and more convenient action, a Constitution and Code of Canons, and did meet in pursuance of that Constitution, in General Council, in November, 1862; and

Whereas, This Church so organized, although arising out of political events, was from that time a duly organized branch of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and may of right so continue to be, or may through the action of its several Diocesan Councils, form any other synodical association; and

Whereas, In the opinion of several of the Dioceses which coöperated in the formation of this independent branch of the Church Catholic, the exigency which caused its arrangement no longer exists; and

Whereas, The spirit of charity which prevailed in the proceedings of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, at its late session in Philadelphia, has warmly commended itself to the hearts of this Council; therefore

Resolved, I. That in the judgment of this Council, it is perfectly consistent with the good faith which she owes to the Bishops and Dioceses with which she has been in union since 1862, for any Diocese to decide for herself whether she shall any longer continue in union with this Council.

II. That it be recommended that wherever the word *Confederate* occurs in the standards of this Church, the word *United* be substituted therefor.

III. That, inasmuch as the change recommended in the preceding resolutions (being a change in the Prayer Book,) cannot be legally completed until the next meeting of this Council, that, under the circumstances, it should, in the meantime, have the force of law in any Diocese, whenever approved by its Bishop or Diocesan Council.

IV. That each Diocese now in connection with this Council shall be governed by the Constitution and Canons thereof until such time as it shall have declared its withdrawal therefrom, as hereinafter provided for.

V. That whenever any Diocese shall determine to withdraw from this Ecclesiastical Confederation, such withdrawal shall be considered as duly accomplished, when an official notice, signed by the Bishop and Secretary of such Diocese, shall have been given to the Bishops of the Dioceses remaining in connection with this Council.

These Resolutions were adopted, as also one changing the name of the Church to the "Protestant Episcopal Church of the Associated Dioceses of the United States." Also one appointing Charleston, S. C., as the place of holding the next General Council, in November, 1868.

NEW YORK.

The Annual Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel, New York, Sept. 27. Besides the customary business of the Convention, reading of Annual Reports, &c., all of which indicated the rapid and substantial growth of the Church throughout the State, the most important business before the Convention was the Resolutions on the Provincial System, moved by the Rev. Dr. McVickar, last year, and laid over until this Convention for definite action. After an earnest but brief debate, a vote was taken upon the Preamble and Resolutions, in the following form:

Whereas, The time has come when, by reason of the increase of the population, and the growth of the Church in these United States, a greater number of Bishops is now, or is likely soon to be, required; and, whereas, it is desirable that in providing for this increase in the number of Bishops with their Dioceses, as little change as possible should be made in the conservative spirit of the Church; therefore

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Convention that a Provincial System, adapted to the present position of the Church in this country, should be established. It therefore prays the General Convention to make such provision as may be necessary for the organization of "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," into Provinces.

The vote in favor of these was almost unanimous, and that, in a full Convention; the strength and tone of the *ayes* being unmistakable.

This decided action in the Convention of the Church in the Empire State, after the full and thorough discussion of the subject for the last eighteen months, is full of meaning. The way is now open for the division and working of the Diocese, after the primitive pattern; while, at the same time, the feebleness of the Church shall not be separated from the strong, the bond of unity shall not be broken, and, at the same time, such concentration and combination of effort may be secured, as the wants of the different portions of the Church, and her abundant resources, may demand.

Another subject, which seemed to be in almost every mind, was the stand which the Convention ought to take, in sustaining the Bishop in his late Pastoral Letter; and especially in vindicating the honor of the Church, by rebuking the insolent defiance with which the Pastoral Letter has been met, in a certain quarter. We have never seen the feeling of the great body of the Convention, and especially of the Laity, so decided, and almost irrepressible. At the earnest request of the Bishop, however, the matter was not brought forward in Convention. The Bishop's allusion to the subject in his Annual Address, though somewhat general, was well understood; and if men are not infatuated, and bent on mischief at any and every sacrifice, further disturbance of the peace and harmony of the Church will be avoided. The General Convention have decided, what we all knew before, that the Law of the Church is as clear and plain as it need be: and by that Law, the Church will assuredly abide.

PENNSYLVANIA.

NEW DIOCESE OF PITTSBURGH, and election of its first Bishop. The Primary Convention of this new Diocese met in Trinity Church, Pittsburgh, Nov. 15; when the New Diocese was formally organized. There were present, at the opening Services, 24 Clergy of the Diocese, and Lay delegates from 25 Parishes. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Stevens preached the Sermon. On the next day, the new Bishop was elected. The Rev. Mr. Swope nominated the Rev. JOHN BARRETT KERFOOT, D. D., President of Trinity Collège, Hartford, Conn. The Rev. Dr. Page, nominated the Rev. FREDERICK D. HUNTINGTON, D. D., Rector of Emmanuel Church, Boston, Mass. The vote of the Clergy was, for the Rev. Dr. Kerfoot, 19; for Rev. Dr. Huntington 9. The vote of the Laity, was; "approved," 19; "disapproved," 8; divided, 1. After debate, it was voted that the New Diocese be called the DIOCESE OF PITTSBURGH. The regular officers of the Diocese were elected; and the salary of the Bishop fixed at \$4,500. An Episcopal Fund has already been raised, of about \$40,000. There are, in the Diocese, 37 Parishes; 17 self supporting; and 27 Presbyters, canonically resident. It contains 25 Counties, over 20,000 square miles, and about one million of inhabitants. This whole movement, so nobly consummated, is one of the greatest possible importance. It is the first substantial triumph, in this country, of an elementary, vital principle of Church life and growth. It already proves what abundant resources, now lying utterly waste, will be developed, as soon as the

Church returns to her normal mode of action. This principle is too deeply fixed in the minds and hearts of Churchmen now, to be arrested in its progress. It is a great Truth; and such a Truth never dies.

CHURCH AT THE SOUTH.—We are glad to welcome once more the appearance of the *Church Intelligencer*, published at Charlotte, N. C., the accredited Organ of the Bishops of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, and the University of the South. It is conducted with ability and wisdom; and will have great influence, in diffusing correct information at the South, concerning Northern sentiment, and so, in counteracting the effects of any element of mischief which may still exist, either there or here. The Rev. Messrs. F. M. Hubbard, D. D., and George M. Everhart, are its Editors.

GEORGIA.—We find the following in the N. C. *Church Intelligencer* of Oct. 18, where it is copied from the Augusta, Ga., *Constitutionalist*.

"Many of the leading Methodist divines of our State have, with the approval of their congregations, made overtures to the Episcopal Church of Georgia, and some of the clerical officers of the Triennial Convention, to unite with the Episcopal Church. Their hostility to Northern Methodism, and its incidental hatred of the South in years past, is said to be the prime motive of the act."

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL FREEDMAN'S AID SOCIETY.—The Freedman's Aid Commission, constituted by the unanimous vote of the late General Convention, was organized, Nov. 10th, in the City of New York, by the election of the following officers:—

Recording Secretary.—Rev. John A. Aspinwall.

Corresponding Secretary.—Rev. Dr. Wharton.

Treasurer.—Robert B. Minturn, Esq.

Executive Committee.—Rev. Dr. Haight, Rev. Dr. A. H. Vinton, Rev. Dr. Littlejohn, Rev. Dr. Eccleston; Messrs. Hamilton Fish, F. S. Winston, G. D. Morgan, and John Welsh.—After a free and full discussion, one important principle was definitely settled, at the meeting for the organization of the Society. All efforts for the elevation of freedmen are to be made in connection and coöperation with the Ecclesiastical authorities of the South. The white and the colored races are there to live together. The horrid barbarities of Jamaica must be averted. Besides, kind feeling between the races, is indispensable to the work which the Aid Society proposes to do. The warm hearted Christian sentiment of the South will respond to overtures made in fraternal confidence; but it will not be dictated to, as it has been, by some Northern, conceited radicals, who have just returned from that field. Stations have been already offered in some of the chief Southern centres, where teachers, selected and supported by the Commission, will be accepted and aided by the Ecclesiastical authorities; and teachers are ready for the work as soon as the requisite funds can be secured. Prospectively, and looking to the Christianizing of Africa, this Society has before it a vast and most promising field. It is the African Mission at our own doors; without its romance, without its deadly climate, but with every facility of success.

oo
ed
he
D.,
pi,
nd
is-
at
ng
er
ge

er
st.
ne
al
al
to
rs
d-
te
w

n,
F.
ll
t-
n
e-
es
st
le
d
in
y
at
n
n,
i-
l.
is
n
y